THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT WITH SPECIAL APPLICATION TO THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH TODAY

HUGH NEAL MC CALLUM

BT
121.2
M33
1952
GTU
[redacted]
[redacted]

Gift of
Hugh Vernon White
In Memory of

MOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
RELIGION

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

WITH SPECIAL APPLICATION TO THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH TODAY

by

Hugh Neal McCallum
B.A., University of Oregon, 1926

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

THESIS

Submitted in the Department of Christian Theology
in partial fulfillment for the degree of
Master of Arts
in the
Pacific School of Religion
June, 1952

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

62083

BT
121.2
M33
1952

RT
M124w

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/workofholyspirit00unse

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
Chapter		
I.	THE HOLY SPIRIT IN OLD TESTAMENT TIMES	5
II.	THE HOLY SPIRIT AND JESUS	12
III.	PENTECOST	25
IV.	THE OPERATIONS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE EARLY CHURCH	31
V.	THE HOLY SPIRIT TO THE CREED OF NICAEA	48
VI.	THE HOLY SPIRIT FROM NICAEA TO THE REFORMATION	57
VII.	REDISCOVERY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT BY THE REFORMATION	62
VIII.	IS THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IMPORTANT FOR TODAY?	69
IX.	THE BELIEVERS' RECEPTION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN RELATIONSHIP	74
X.	THE HOLY SPIRIT AS A SOURCE OF POWER	81
XI.	A SOURCE OF GUIDANCE THROUGH THE WORD	85
XII.	THE HOLY SPIRIT AS A SOURCE OF UNITY AND ORDER	90
XIII.	A BOND OF FELLOWSHIP IN WORSHIP	96
BIBLIOGRAPHY		102

INTRODUCTION

We confess a certain hesitancy in one's soul as we begin a study of the work of the Holy Spirit. That this hesitancy is partly a sense of reverence and partly a sense of humility may readily be admitted. Then again, we are confronted by a depth and scope in our subject so that we entertain a certain perplexity as to what should be the proper starting point.

There is, in our time, a lack of understanding in the average man of the life and work of the Holy Spirit, for which there are many reasons. An incident in the Scriptures seems to approximate our present situation as to the Holy Spirit. A group of people living in Ephesus considered themselves Christians; but they knew nothing of the Holy Spirit. These people became known to us as Paul visited them and asked them: "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?" And they said, "No, we have never even heard that there is a Holy Spirit." (Acts 19:2) This incident stands out rather boldly in the New Testament because these Ephesian Christians were an exception to the rule in the life of the Early Church. All other mention of the Holy Spirit seems to be with a general understanding and appreciation of His work and influence in the person of all Christians.

The Christianity that these people of Ephesus learned had come from Apollos, the Alexandrian missionary. "He was an

eloquent man, well versed in the scriptures. He had been instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in spirit, he spoke and taught accurately the things concerning Jesus, though he knew only the baptism of John." (Acts 18:24-25) It seems likely that a man of Alexandrian background would present the gospel as a philosophy of life.[1] His scriptural background appears to be adequate, but his "fervent in spirit" appears to be that of the physical and unrelated to the Holy Spirit. His knowledge of Jesus had stopped short of one important matter, Jesus' baptism, for he knew only of John's. Upon this point the ever faithful companions of Paul, Priscilla and Aquila, "expounded to him the way of God more accurately." (Acts 18:24) The sum total of the incident is that the Holy Spirit as far as the people of Ephesus were concerned was a spiritual power with which they were wholly unacquainted.

It is not our feeling that the average Christian is devoid of any idea of the Holy Spirit. He has heard of the Holy Spirit and possibly has become familiar with the term. But he is not clear as to whether he personally wants to have anything to do with this spiritual power or whether it has anything to do with him. He knows of groups of Christians that carry on so-called orgies of the spirit and their actions and conduct during these spasms seem most disorderly and uninviting. The whole subject seems to relate itself to mysticism, and of this our average Christian wants no part.

---

[1]James D. Smart, What a Man Can Believe (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943), p. 147.

Possibly it is more accurate to say that our knowledge of the Holy Spirit is confused. On the one hand is the ecstatic experience with speaking in tongues and healings; on the other the formalized worship of God that depends upon visible symbols and ritual; then there is the authoritarian type of worship in which all is centered in a priesthood and sacerdotal system; and there is also the form of worship that depends entirely on works. So, what can the average Christian believe? What is the work of the Holy Spirit as far as he is concerned?

A group of intelligent young people were asked to write down something of their idea of the Holy Spirit. The composite of what they had to say could be reduced to "the unseen something that encourages us to go on believing in Jesus."[1] This indeed suggests a dimness that is nothing short of confusion, although these young people might not have had too wide an experience as to definite teaching about the Holy Spirit. Let us hasten to say, in defense of young people, that they are not alone in their vagueness and indefiniteness regarding the Holy Spirit.

We have all had the experience of reading a book that, in spite of our attention to its thought, has remained vague and confused in our minds, but upon subsequent reading and study has become clear and meaningful. We recognize that the vagueness has been within ourselves and not in the author. Just so, our vagueness and uneasy feeling about the Holy Spirit can be termed a "blind spot" in our religion.[2] This

---

[1]Henry D. Gray, A Theology for Christian Youth (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1941), p. 60.

[2]Smart, op. cit., p. 150.

was true of both Apollos and the Ephesian Christians. The blind spot in the experience of Apollos was corrected by teaching on the part of Priscilla and Aquila and that of the Ephesians by later teaching of Paul (Acts 19:3-7) where it is definitely stated that they did receive the Holy Spirit.

That there is profit, and that of a most desirable form, in the reception and understanding of the Holy Spirit is evident from the above cited incident in the Scriptures. Certainly we are enlightened enough to know that to veer off from a belief because false and repellent forms of it appear is illogical and unscientific. Even a cursory reading of the New Testament will convince one that the Early Church had an inner power that gave it the courage and fortitude which we lack today. They as individuals experienced this and were made mighty to do the work of God and to testify of a living Christ. That this same mighty work needs to be done today is an understatement of the facts of our life.

We approach this study in the hope that it will be the means of help toward a better understanding of the life and work of the Holy Spirit and still more that it will be a means whereby some will experience the power of the Holy Spirit in their own lives.

CHAPTER I

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN OLD TESTAMENT TIMES

In the Old Testament there are numerous references to the Spirit of God as a creative force and as the agency through which the Divine touches and affects human life. A survey of the Old Testament may classify the Holy Spirit in five relationships as follows: He was the active energy in creation, in the intellectual life of man, in the inspirational tasks of those times, in the moral changes that were wrought, and in the office and work of the prophets.

1. Creation.-- He appears first in the morning of time in conjunction with the word: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters, and God said, Let there be light: and there was light." (Gen. 1:1-3) Amid the scene of gloom and desolation the one active agency was the Spirit of God. The term used in the Hebrew is ruach, which is best described "as loud, violent breathing and frequently applied to the wind which swept down the mountain gorges and whirled across the desert wastes."[1] The marginal rendering also gives "was brooding upon" which suggests the

---

[1]F. W. Dillistone, The Holy Spirit in the Life of Today (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1947), p. 22.

image of a bird brooding over its nest. This later thought is preferable since "it was not the wind but the divine energy that must be regarded as vitalizing the germs which the divine Word is about to call forth."[1] The brooding Spirit suggests more than mere power; it is a power that cares and regards. Power alone may crush; but motivated by care, it suggests personality and intelligence working in a creative manner toward the good.

The primary thought that we find is that God is active through His Spirit. This activity is not that of a primary creation and rest, but one of continuous and sustaining action.[2] "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty giveth me life." (Job 33:4) "Thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created." (Ps. 104:29-30) These passages indicate that in the ceaseless process of nature God's Spirit is always active. The universal presence of the Spirit in nature is admirably expressed by the Psalmist:

> Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there. If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall overwhelm me, and the light about me shall be night: Even the darkness hideth not from thee, But the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee.
> (Ps. 139:7-12)

---

[1]H. B. Swete, "Holy Spirit," Hastings Dictionary of the Bible (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), Vol. II, p. 403.

[2]Charles L. Slattery, The Light Within (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1915), p. 19.

2. The Intellectual Life of Man.-- "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. 2:7) Thus was accomplished the ideal of God expressed in the words: "Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness." (Gen. 1:26) "In the image of God" (Gen. 1:27) could not mean man's body since God has not a body; but likeness of soul -- ability to think, to feel, to purpose, to create, to be self-conscious. This enephusese (John 20:22) represents the Breath of God as originating the personal life of man, together with the intellectual and spiritual powers which distinguish it from the life of the mere animal.[1] Here we see that the creative work of the Spirit of God brought man into being; he was like God but not the same, for the word used for man is nephesh (living soul) and not ruach. This word indicates only the principle of life that man as man possesses which may go toward sensual or spiritual ends. This F. W. Dillistone makes clear when he says:

> Man is created a living soul (Nephesh) with a flesh-body; they are not independent of one another, and it is always possible for the soul to become enmeshed within the fleshly or sensual. But there is also the divine Ruach or Pneuma by which God is constantly acting towards the sons of man.[2]

It is well to keep in mind that pneuma is the Greek work for ruach and stands for the dynamic work of God. But also, in a derived sense, it is the part of man's nature that could be

---

[1]Swete, op. cit., p. 403.

[2]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 24.

the area of operation of the divine Spirit.

So in the creation of man, personal life was originated by the Divine Spirit, and those intellectual and spiritual powers were bestowed which forever mark off the life of man from the lower orders of creation. He is a possible dwelling place for the Spirit of God, but not necessarily so.

3. Messiah.-- This conception is one that is prominent in the Old Testament and also must come into our consideration of Jesus and the Holy Spirit; hence, it would seem best to consider it briefly here.

Before the division of the Kingdom of Israel when Amos was an active messenger of God, there was well established in the minds of the people "the day of the Lord" as a sort of "good time coming." But Amos made it plain that it was to be different than their expectations; it was a day of judgment because they had forgotten God. (Amos 3:2) As their condition worsened, Isaiah who loved his nation dearly tried to show them their folly. He could see only a remnant that would live and be the root of the new Jerusalem (Isa. 28:6), and a ruler of the house of David to guide them (Isa. 11:2). "This Davidic King, in whom the elect nation was to find its crown and consummation, must receive all the gifts of the Divine Spirit in their fulness."[1] When we consider also Isa. 42:1 and 61:1 f., the things to be accomplished by this "Anointed One" are most impressive. We know, of course, that this hope became centered in a visible leader, a king who would lead in

---

[1]Swete, op. cit., p. 403.

bloody battles and be more powerful than any the world had ever known. We also know that men tried in vain to meet these ideals and failed most miserably during the period of the Maccabees. These failures, however, do not dim the fact that the hope rested firmly on the power of the Spirit that was to be in the Messiah.

It is of interest to note that Jesus regarded the statements of Isaiah 40:1 and 61:1-2 as applying to himself. "Mine elect, in whom My soul delighteth" of Isaiah 40:1 is found in the New Testament to read "Thou art my beloved Son, with thee I am well pleased."[1] Since none of the disciples was present at the baptism of Jesus, the source of this application must be Jesus himself. The rejection of Jesus at Nazareth gives us the use by Jesus of Isaiah 61:1-2 almost as given in the Scriptures as it applied to the ministry that he was to perform:

> The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.
>
> (Luke 4:18-19)

As the Messiah Jesus possessed the Spirit in a way that the prophets did not. His life was one that was completely given to the sway of the Spirit.[2]

4. <u>The Life and Message of the Prophets</u>.-- Since the comparison of the Spirit of God in the prophets and in Jesus

---

[1]Mk. 1:11; Matt. 3:17; Lk. 3:22.

[2]Dillistone, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 30.

has been made, it is well to note the relationship of the prophets to the Spirit.

References to the Spirit in connection with the prophets are almost too numerous to mention. We read time after time of the Spirit coming upon them or entering into them. It is true that the Spirit works through human personality in every age. But especially in the prophets do we see the invasion of "The Spirit" into the affairs of men. These men were summoned to new and in most cases revolutionary tasks. They were more or less unwilling to enter this calling of God. Isaiah made the confession that he "was a man of unclean lips," and Jeremiah that he "was but a child." They were great moral teachers and leaders, the advisors of kings and the guides of the social, political and religious life of their days. They lived in the freedom of the Spirit, but withal they were not popular and were even accused of being unpatriotic. Nowhere do we find them claiming perfection nor having it claimed for them by their associates. While boldly proclaiming "the word of the Lord," they did not claim to do the whole will of God. In this we see the main difference between the prophets' and Jesus' relation to the Spirit.

Their work was also to tell of the future. In their message we find many references to the operations of the Spirit, which were to be frequent in later times -- operations which would spread abroad holiness, justice, peace and consolation. In the old era the Spirit came only upon the chosen few. In the new era this would be different according to the words of Joel 2:28:

> And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions; and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit.

Thus do they tell of the new day in which the operation of the Spirit will be different. Peter, of course, spoke of the fulfillment of this prophecy on the Day of Pentecost and declared that the Messiah had sent forth the Spirit on that occasion. (Acts 2)

In general the Spirit in the Old Testament is God at work both in the world and in human life. There is in man the urge to look for God in the external and the distant; but there is also a growing tendency to realize that this unseen power of God can work in the heart of man. But even in this there is the conception of God's Spirit entering a man or lifting him up or taking hold of him. This appears to be in the forefront of their thinking of the Spirit. We go along with C. E. Slattery when he says:

> When all is told, it is safe to say that, had it not been for the experience of the New Testament times, the intimations of the Holy Spirit would not have been sufficient to make men conscious of the source of the help which came to them individually and together.[1]

---

[1]Slattery, op. cit., p. 32 f.

CHAPTER II

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND JESUS

The New Testament opens its message with the operations of the Holy Spirit and continues this mighty manifestation of God's power throughout twenty-seven books. The principal characters are men filled with the Holy Spirit as are those who form the new people of God guided by the Holy Spirit.

In confining this particular part of our study to the four gospels, we at once run into the problem that arises from a sense of chronology. Admittedly there were Christian writings that antedate the gospels, notedly those of Paul. Yet the ideas expressed in the gospels were those that preceded Paul's although they were written later in point of time. There is a revealing statement in the New Testament that will aid us in an appreciation of this point: "His disciples did not understand this at first; but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that this had been written of him and had been done to him."[1] Although it will be our method to take the books of the New Testament in the order in which they appear in our Bible, yet the element of time will also be recognized in the development of our thesis.

1. The Birth of Jesus.-- As regards this relationship of Jesus to the Holy Spirit, we recognize that there are many

---

[1]John 12:16; cf. Mk. 9:32; Lk. 18:34; John 10:6.

mysteries, and that we will not be able to explain these mysteries.

In point of time we realize that the earliest gospel, Mark, makes no mention of the birth of Jesus. Also we must very frankly confess that the writings of Paul make no mention of this event, and that at least Galatians and Romans are earlier even than the Gospel of Mark. One can even go further in generalization and remark that the conception of Jesus by the Holy Spirit is never mentioned in any book of the New Testament other than Matthew and Luke, and not again by them after they have made a record of it in their early chapters. One can naturally ask the question, Why then is it recorded at all?

Undoubtedly the accounts of Jesus' birth as recorded by Matthew and Luke are to explain his supernatural entrance into the world through the Holy Spirit. "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God."[1] "Be called holy" refers to the body of Christ as seen in Heb. 7:26: "For it is fitting that we should have such a high priest, holy, blameless, unstained, separated from sinners, exalted above the heavens." And in Peter 2:22: "He committed no sin; no guile was found on his lips." The comment of J. W. McGarvey on this point is of great interest:

> Since the Evangelist is here speaking about the body and human nature of Jesus, it is possible that he may

---

[1]Luke 1:35; cf. also Matt. 1:20.

> here speak of Jesus as the Son of God in the same sense in which he called Adam the son of God (Lk. 3:38); that is, his body and human nature were the direct and miraculous production of the divine power.[1]

This account of Jesus' birth tells how he came into the world, but as a result does not ascribe any special powers unto Jesus, nor place him in any special position or station in life. The "will be called" we must note is future.

This being so, our original question still obtains. It is my belief that at least one reason the birth story of Jesus was recorded by both Matthew and Luke is to answer and discredit stories current in their time that Jesus was an illegitimate child. That these stories were circulated quite early in the history of the Christian movement seems certain in the opinion of John Herbert Otwell.[2] There are a great many allusions in Jewish writings to these stories, but for our purpose we desire to list just one, this one being "the earliest authenticated passage ascribing illegitimate birth to Jesus" according to the Jewish Encyclopedia.[3] The best translation is given by Morris Goldstein:[4]

> Text:- Rabbi Shimeon ben Azzai said, "I found a scroll of genealogical record in Jerusalem and in it is written, 'A certain person was illegitimately born of a married woman.' To support the words of Rabbi Yehoshua." (M. Yebamoth IV, 13:1, B. Yebamoth 49a)

---

[1]J. W. McGarvey, The Fourfold Gospel (Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Co., 1902), p. 16.

[2]J. H. Otwell, Class notes in Introduction to the New Testament, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif., 1949.

[3]S. Krauss, Jesus of Nazareth. The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VII (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1906), p. 170.

[4]Morris Goldstein, Jesus in the Jewish Tradition (New York: Macmillan Co., 1950), p. 67.

We note that Morris Goldstein claims that this does not refer to Jesus mainly on the grounds that little reference was taken of the man Jesus by the rabbis of that day and he was therefore not a prominent person who needed to be referred to by an allusion.[1] We feel that the allusion was made necessary since Jesus had made Messianic claims, and trouble with the Romans who were in power could only be avoided by this method. One must remember that for nearly two hundred years a great deal of trouble had come to the Roman rule through Jewish men who had claimed to be Messiahs and that the very destruction of Jerusalem and the almost complete destruction of the Jewish race came about principally for this reason.

We are especially interested in Morris Goldstein's dating of Azzai as 90-125 A.D. and the words which he spoke in support of Rabbi Yehoshua who in his youth sang in the temple at Jerusalem.[2] Thus we have a man involved in the transmission of the story of the illegitimate birth of Jesus dating back at least to 70 A.D., previous to the destruction of Jerusalem. It can also be observed that it would be difficult to find a book of genealogies in Jerusalem after its destruction. Both considerations would give us dates at the time and before the writing of both Matthew and Luke.[3] It is

---

[1] Ibid., p. 68.

[2] Ibid., p. 67.

[3] M. S. Enslin, Christian Beginnings (New York: Harper & Bros., 1938) dates Matthew about 90 A.D., p. 399, and Luke about 95 A.D., p. 412. E. J. Goodspeed, A Life of Jesus (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950) dates Matthew about 80 A.D. and Luke about 90 A.D., p. 16.

thus very probable that Matthew and Luke were attempting to answer this charge of illegitimacy against Jesus' birth. That the Christian family was very conscious of these stories can be readily seen by the numerous references to it in writings of the Early Fathers.[1]

What we have said above may give the impression that the birth story of Jesus as given by Matthew and Luke was a figment of their imagination and a defense mechanism entirely. It is an effective silencing of the slander of the name of Jesus; but it is more than that, as R. Birch Hoyle has written:

> The operation of the Holy Spirit superceding human paternity at the conception of Jesus is absolutely unique. Although Old Testament birth-stories, as of Isaac and Samuel, have coloured Luke's diction, there is strictly no parallel in Scripture, and supposed pagan illustrations can scarcely apply in view of the Jewish-Christian sources from which the narratives must come.[2]

Luke most certainly had the idea that through the birth of Jesus God had brought triumph for his people, and both accounts together show that the entrance of Jesus into the world was the inauguration of God's new creation.[3] But

---

[1]The Anti-Nicene Fathers (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1886). Origen, Contra Celsus. 1:28, p. 410, Vol. IV. "Celsus makes the statement in another passage, where he refers to even a written source, adding that the seducer was a soldier by the name of Panthera." p. 408, "born of a woman turned out of doors by her husband because she was convicted of adultery." Vol. VII. p. 418. Acts of Pilate (Gospel of Nicodemus) 1:2. "Born of fornication." (This is admittedly Fourth Century but the Acts of Pilate are mentioned in Justine's First Apology, Vol. I, p. 175.

[2]R. Birch Hoyle, "Holy Spirit," Encyclopedia of Religions and Ethics (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), Vol. XI., p. 792.

[3]Cf. Isa. 7:14; Mic. 5:2; Hos. 11:1; Jer. 31:14.

the life and teachings of Jesus as the Christ, his death and burial and resurrection was the gospel preached by the early church. This in itself would be the reason we do not find any further use of the birth-story in the New Testament writings.

2. The Baptism of Jesus.-- When Jesus was "about thirty years of age," he journeyed to the Jordan River where John the Baptist was preaching a message of repentance that had profoundly stirred the entire Jewish nation. Jesus' purpose was undoubtedly to identify himself with this great movement of righteousness for he submitted to the baptism that John preached.

> In those days Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan. And when he came up out of the water, immediately he saw the heavens opened and the Spirit descended upon him like a dove; and a voice came from heaven, "Thou art my beloved Son; with thee I am well pleased."[1]

In Mark's account, as in the other Synoptics, the Holy Spirit comes "like a dove," without any thought that there was a dove in actual form. In the dramatic style of Mark, it is here shown that Jesus understands that he is the Messiah and that God has anointed him to this office. Peter so designates this event when he says:

> The word which was proclaimed throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee after the baptism which John preached: how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power; how he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him. (Acts 10:37-38)

---

[1]Mk. 1:9-11; Matt. 3:13-17; Lk. 3:21-22. Matthew uses "this is" instead of the "thou art" of Mark and Luke, indicating the public was to hear the message.

Thus Jesus was consecrated to his Messianic office in all the fullness of its functions and powers. That this is true can be seen from the next event in Jesus' life and the subsequent events of his ministry.

John, writing of the work of Jesus following his baptism, says: "For he whom God has sent utters the words of God, for it is not by measure that he gives the Spirit; the Father loves the Son, and has given all things into his hand.[1] The view of the Apostles and the early church is without doubt that Jesus was fully possessed by the Holy Spirit.

3. The Temptation of Jesus.-- This event follows immediately upon the baptism of Jesus. "The Spirit immediately drove him out into the wilderness. And he was in the wilderness forty days, tempted by Satan." (Mark 1:12-13) "Then Jesus was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil." (Matt. 4:1) "And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit." (Lk. 4:1) Not only does Jesus feel the inner possession of the Spirit, but these three passages indicate to what extent he felt guided by and under the constraint of the Spirit.

Following the account as given by Luke, we find that the first temptation is, "If you are the Son of God, command this stone to become bread." And Jesus answered him, "It is

---

[1]John 3:34-34. Goodspeed: "for God gives him his Spirit without measure." Moffatt: "God gives him the Spirit in no sparing measure." Weymouth: "For God does not give the Spirit with limitations."

written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone.'"[1] This is a temptation to follow the Priestly Messiah, the doing of good and the feeding of the people, as his calling in life. This Jesus rejects and he rejects it on the word of the Holy Spirit.

The devil next took him up where all the kingdoms of the world were shown to him and said, "To you I will give all this authority and their glory; for it has been delivered to me, and I give it to whom I will. If you, then, will worship me, it shall all be yours." And Jesus answered, "It is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve.'"[2] This temptation is based on the Davidic Kingdom or "Son of David" expectation, a temporal kingdom of power and glory which conception seemed to be very strong among the disciples of Jesus, even to the close of his ministry. Again his rejection comes in the words of the Holy Spirit.

The third temptation as given by Luke is:

> And he took him to Jerusalem, and set him on the pinnacle of the temple, and said to him, "If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down from here; for it is written,
> 'He will give his angels charge of you, to guard you,'
> and
> 'On their hands they will bear up up,
> lest you strike your foot against a stone.'"
> And Jesus answered him, "It is said, 'You shall not tempt the Lord your God.'"[3]

This temptation is undoubtedly that expectation of the Messiah as conceived by Enoch as a super-human "Son of Man."[4]

---

[1]Luke 4:3-4; cf. Deut. 8:3b.

[2]Luke 4:6-8; cf. Deut. 6:13.

[3]Luke 4:9-12. Cf. Ps. 91:11-12; Deut. 6:16.

[4]I Enoch 46:1-6.

All of these Messianic ideals were rejected by Jesus, upon which the Jewish people had built their hopes as they had conceived them from the Psalms, the book of Daniel and the writings of Enoch.[1] Luke has Jesus going to Galilee "in the power of the Spirit" immediately after the temptations, and entering the synagogue at Nazareth, his home city. Here he reads from Isaiah a passage that describes his work as that of the Suffering Servant.[2] This is his conception of the type of Messiah he is to be, a Messiah that no one expected.

It must be borne in mind that the baptismal story as well as that of the temptation of Jesus in their original form came from Jesus; hence both are to be conceived as his own description of what happened. It is of interest in this regard to note the words of J. Smart:

> Thus when it is said that the Holy Spirit came on him we must give the words their full significance, a relationship between Jesus and the Spirit of God came that had not formerly been realized.
>
> Jesus was filled with the Spirit, and it was in the power of this Spirit that he was enabled to live the life and do the mighty works that he did from that time on. Men were conscious of an overwhelming power working in him. They said that his word was "with power."[3]

It might appear to some that this unlimited power of the spirit would make of Jesus a worker of magic instead of a "Suffering Servant Messiah." J. Smart is quick to correct such a view when he says:

---

[1]Edgar J. Goodspeed, A Life of Jesus (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950), p. 42.

[2]Isaiah 62:1-2.

[3]Smart, op. cit., p. 153.

> The Spirit was not an impersonal Divine something which became an unconditional possession even with him. It was a fellowship sustained by prayer which needed for its preservation those quiet hours when he withdrew himself from his disciples.[1]

We feel that this fellowship was also sustained by a life of perfect obedience to the Father even as Jesus said: "Truly, truly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing." (John 5:19)[2]

4. The Ministry of Jesus.-- This prophecy of Isaiah, Jesus accepted as his own commission, and with it he entered his ministry. His ministry had not been under way long until we find an incident revealing that his deeds and words are the message of the Holy Spirit. It is recorded by all the Synoptic gospels; Mark places it just following his formal call of the twelve disciples. (Mark 3:20-30) He has cast out an unclean spirit from a man and the scribes accuse him of being in league with Beelzebub: "He is possessed by Beelzebub, and by the prince of demons he casts out demons." Jesus counters with the argument that if this were true, then Satan is divided against himself. Something contrary to this is the truth.

> He claims that He exercises this power by the Holy Spirit, i.e., as possessed by the Spirit of God, which, works for the establishment of the divine reign on earth by overthrowing the reign of Satan.[3]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 154.

[2]Cf. John 5:30; 8:28; 14:10; Matt. 12:50.

[3]James Moffatt, The Theology of the Gospels (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), p. 178.

His next thought is that concerning the binding of the strong man before one can plunder his house. This without a doubt refers to Jesus' victory over Satan in the temptations, where he bound the strong man. But the high point of the incident is where Jesus says:

> "Truly, I say to you, all sins will be forgiven the sons of men, and whatever blasphemies they utter; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin" -- for they had said, "He has an unclean spirit."[1]

These are strong words to meet strong judgments against him. But they bring out the extent of the Holy Spirit's power and possession of Jesus.

> It is this consciousness of being an organ of the Holy Spirit which prompts the saying of Jesus that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, such as the Scribes uttered in ascribing His excorcism to Satanic influence, was beyond all pardon.[2]

These works of power, or signs, authenticated Jesus as God's messenger, whom it was perilous to despise as the Hebrews conceived of the prophetic authority.[3] It is especially true in this case because what Jesus had said had come to pass and all could see that Jesus spoke the truth, the message of the Spirit of God.

His words were "with power" and caused "astonishment," and he could say, "You have heard it said, but I say unto you." Men sought him because of his words and deeds: "Rabbi, we know

---

[1]Mark 3:28-30. Cf. Matt. 12:31; Lk. 8:23, "will not be forgiven."

[2]Moffatt, op. cit., p. 179.

[3]Deut. 18:19-20.

that you are a teacher come from God; for no one can do these signs that you do, unless God is with him." (John 3:2) The entire life of Jesus is that of one led of the Spirit even unto his death, as the writer of the Book of Hebrews discloses: "Who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God." (Heb. 9:14)

5. The Promise of the Holy Spirit by Jesus.-- Time and again Jesus had told his disciples that he was to leave them, that he was to be crucified and die. But they did not seem to understand fully his meaning. Speaking to Peter, James, John and Andrew, he told of the time of trouble ahead when they would be sore distressed and said: "And when they bring you to trial and deliver you up, do not be anxious beforehand what you are to say; but say whatever is given you in that hour, for it is not you who speak, but the Holy Spirit."[1] Jesus made it plain to his disciples that it was necessary for him to go away when he said: "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is to your advantage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the Counselor will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you." (John 16:7) This Counselor was the Holy Spirit, who would guide them into all truth, who would be in them.[2] The audience upon all these occasions to which Jesus speaks and makes this promise is the disciples of Jesus, later designated as Apostles.

Some feel that this is a view held only by John, in

---

[1]Mark 13:3,11. Cf. Matt. 10:20.

[2]John 14:16, 25-26; 15:26.

spite of the fact that we have already shown that Mark does collaborate in the view that the apostles were to receive the Holy Spirit. But Luke also shares this view when he says: "And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but stay in the city, until you are clothed with power from on high." (Luke 24:49) Luke continues in the opening of "The Acts of the Apostles" with this same promise to the apostles "while staying with them" and tells them to stay in Jerusalem, and in a few days "you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit." And "you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth."[1] To make it entirely clear after the ascension of Jesus has taken place, Luke mentions the eleven apostles by name who were in the company on that occasion. (Acts 1:13)

With the work of Jesus completed, the apostles having been commissioned[2] to their task and promised the guidance and possession of the Holy Spirit, all is ready to set in operation the gospel of Jesus Christ. Here we recall the words of Jesus as he said: "It is the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail; the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life." (John 6:63)

---

[1]Acts 1:4,5,8.

[2]Matt. 28:18-20; Lk. 24:45-49; Acts 1:8.

CHAPTER III

PENTECOST

There are a great many things in God's revelation that culminate at Pentecost as there are a great many things which also have their beginning at this event. So far we have shown that the great prophetic message is pointing to a certain focus and Jesus has made his disciples a momentous promise. These we believe come together at Pentecost. The event cannot but have tremendous consequences for the Christian life.

The story of this event is given in the second chapter of Acts, and the careful study of this story should yield very fruitful light on our understanding of the Holy Spirit.

We have noted that the promise of the baptism of the Holy Spirit was given to his immediate disciples, who are referred to as apostles in the Book of Acts. That these men, now brought to twelve by the addition of Matthias, were the ones who received this baptism at Pentecost seems clear.

(1) We note again the importance of the fact that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was promised to the apostles only.

(2) They were the ones commissioned to set up the kingdom, and they would need the power of the Spirit to guide them into all truth and carry out this commission.

(3) As we read Acts 2:1-4, which describes the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the "they" referred to must by the rules of grammar be the antecedent noun, "the eleven

apostles." (1:26) It is also to be noted in this connection that in the original there were no chapters or verses.

(4) The effect of the out-pouring of the Spirit was that those who received the Spirit spoke in tongues. Many known tongues are listed, but it is only by manipulation that one can single out twelve, one for each apostle. But the people who heard them speak were amazed and said, "Are not all these who are speaking Galileans?" The eleven apostles were of Galilee, Judas being the only one from Judea. Whether Matthias was from Galilee, we do not know; but the qualification that Judas' place was to be taken by one, "beginning from the baptism of John until the day when he was taken up," would indicate that he could also be a Galilean. That all of the one hundred and twenty (1:15) could be Galileans seems hardly probable.

(5) Another result of this baptism of the Holy Spirit was that the receivers could do "signs and wonders." On this point it is made quite clear that the apostles were the ones who were able to do this thing; no one else shared this power. "And fear came upon every soul; and many wonders of signs were done through the apostles." (2:43)

It is in the matchless sermon preached by Peter on this occasion that we have the reference to the prophecy of the coming of the Spirit "upon all flesh" as given by Joel 2:28-32. And Peter also makes it clear that it is Jesus who has effected this as he had promised: "Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this

which you see and hear." (2:33) Thus we have the coming together of the message of the prophets and the promise of Jesus, all of which we recognize as the work of the Spirit of God working through the ages. That some outstanding eventuality is to be the result seems apparent.

For the first time the facts of the life of Jesus Christ are brought together into one consummating conclusion: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified." (Acts 2:36) This mighty declaration by Peter is the revealed truth and plan of God for man, the height of the divine love toward man. God's great purpose that he purposed from the beginning is fully accomplished; and this is the "Day of the Lord," not of doom, but of blessing and joy.

For the first time it was possible to proclaim the full gospel message of the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus the Christ. These are the facts that beyond dispute make him the saviour of man, and Peter so presents Jesus as that Saviour. It is the beginning of the Church of Jesus Christ on earth, his fellowship of those redeemed in him. Jesus Christ by his kingly authority did through the Holy Spirit in his apostles found his church and also open the kingdom of heaven to the Jews.[1]

There were some three thousand Jews who accepted Jesus as the Christ on that day making up the first church of the

---

[1]V. E. Hoven, Outlines of Biblical Doctrine (Eugene: Northwest Christian College Press, 1948), p. 84.

Christian era. When Peter came to the conclusion of his message that Jesus was the Christ, we note this result:

> Now when they heard this they were cut to the heart, and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, "Brethren, what shall we do?" And Peter said to them, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are far off, every one whom the Lord our God calls to him." (2:37-39)

Here Peter gives forth a promise that is to all who will take Jesus Christ as their Lord. It is a promise of the Holy Spirit to each individual who purposely and consciously enters the Christian life, who takes that life which is ruled by the teachings and ideals that Jesus Christ revealed and to which the Holy Spirit was to give constant witness.

That there is a difference between the baptism of the Holy Spirit which the apostles received and the "gift of the Spirit" which came to each repentant believer in Jesus Christ and the results that followed in each case, it will be our purpose to show in the next chapter.

Although not a part of the Pentecost experience, there is in the Book of Acts an incident that is related to it since the Gentiles are baptized with the Holy Spirit and the Kingdom of God is opened to them as well as to the Jews. The occurrence was in the household of Cornelius, a centurion, in the city of Caesarea. The full story is recorded in the tenth and eleventh chapters of Acts.

It must be observed at this point that, previous to this incident, the spread of the gospel has been limited to the Jews and Samaritans, although the commission as given by

Jesus was to the entire world. Previous to this incident, we have the conversion and call of Paul to the ministry unto the Gentiles, so that the time is ripe for this wider ministry.

First, we note that the Holy Spirit operates to prepare Cornelius who is outstanding in his religious interest. Peter's reluctance to have anything to do with Gentiles is overcome by the Holy Spirit through a vision and direct guidance to the home of Cornelius.

Second, Peter's message (Acts 10:34-43) is uttered upon the assurance that "God shows no partiality" and is substantially the same one preached on the day of Pentecost.

Third, "the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the word," and Peter, in explaining this to the Jerusalem Church afterward, said, "the Holy Spirit fell on them just as on us at the beginning."[1] In these two statements we see that Peter identifies this with the baptism of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost; indeed the speaking in tongues is also present as it was at Pentecost. (10:46)

Fourth, the Jewish Christians with Peter were amazed; but Peter held this to be his authority to command these Gentiles to be baptized with water (10:47), since otherwise he would look upon himself as withstanding God. (11:17)

Fifth, the historian gives the purpose of the incident as the Jerusalem Church gives its evaluation of the event when related by Peter: "Then to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance unto life." (11:18) The impartiality of God was

---

[1]Acts 10:44; 11:15-16.

fully demonstrated. The long standing iron curtain the Jews had erected against the Gentiles was completely demolished. The baptism of the Holy Spirit for the Gentiles, Cornelius and his household being representative of all, was to prove to the Jews of that day, and to everybody ever afterward, that the Gentiles had an equal right in the Kingdom of God.[1]

We hear nothing more of the Gentile group in reference to the spread of the gospel. The apostles that were baptized by the Holy Spirit were, shall we say, very ordinary men. The vitality and fruitfulness of the Apostolic Church cannot be attributed to anything other than the out-pouring of the Spirit of God at Pentecost.[2]

---

[1]Hoven, op. cit., p. 85.

[2]J. Smart, op. cit., p. 156.

CHAPTER IV

THE OPERATIONS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE EARLY CHURCH

It is our observation that the Book of Acts describes three manifestations, endowments, or gifts of the Holy Spirit, and that these are confirmed by the other books of the New Testament.

1. The Baptism of the Holy Spirit.-- This has been described in the previous chapter on the Pentecost experience of the church. There remains for our consideration, however, the results of that baptism. So far in this consideration only the speaking in tongues has been noted, and we would like to add here that the tongues mentioned were known tongues that could be understood. It was not speaking in a gibberish that would only cause confusion by those who heard and in that case would not be accounted as any sign of God's working.

We have also noted that there were "wonders and signs" accomplished by the apostles. In the record we find that they did many things. Peter caused the lame man to walk in Jerusalem, "took him by the right hand and raised him up," and was able to detect the lie of Ananias and Sapphira "to the Holy Spirit." Aeneas who was bedridden eight years was told to "rise and make your bed." Tabitha who was dead was told, "Tabitha, rise." Elymas on the isle of Cyprus was "not to see the sun for a time." In Iconium with Paul many "signs

and wonders" were wrought. At Lystra a cripple was told to "stand up right on your feet." A demon possessed girl in Phillipi heard from Paul, "I charge you in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her." And in Ephesus it is said of Paul's work that there were "extraordinary miracles by the hands of Paul."[1] In all of this Paul is considered as an apostle on the same level as Peter.[2]

There appears to be a very definite guidance of the Spirit given to these apostles by the Holy Spirit. Peter and John become very bold to speak out "filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke the word of God with boldness"; their minds were opened to truths in such a way that they could say, "David, thy servant, didst say by the Holy Spirit"; Paul and his companions were "forbidden to go to Asia" and also into Bithynia; that Paul "resolved in the Spirit" to go to certain places; and that he was going to Jerusalem, "bound in the Spirit" and that the Holy Spirit told him that "imprisonment and afflictions await me."[3]

---

[1]Acts 3:1-10; 5:1-11; 9:32-34; 9:36-42; 13:4-12; 14:3; 14:8-11; 16:16-18; 19:11 ff.

[2]It must be assumed that Paul had received the baptism of the Holy Spirit for in all things he is jealous to hold to his status as a true apostle as he defends it in Galations. He shows that he has the signs of a true apostle when he says, "The signs of a true apostle were performed among you in all patience, with signs and wonders and mighty works." (2 Cor. 12:12) When Ananias came to him in Damascus, he said, "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus who appeared to you on the road by which you came, has sent me that you may regain your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit." (Acts 9:17) These along with the other happenings in his life placed him alongside the other apostles.

[3]Acts 4:13,31; 4:25; 16:6,7; 19:21; 20:22.

Not only was the word that the apostles spoke confirmed by the signs and wonders, but they were actually guided in the work of establishing the church.

As a result of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the apostles also had the power to confer spiritual gifts upon those whom they selected for that purpose, or who were selected by the church.

(1) The Seven at Jerusalem. (Acts 6:1-8) Here the seven are named and it is the church that made the selection. "These they set before the apostles, and they prayed and laid their hands upon them." Stephen being one of the seven "did great wonders and signs among the people." Philip was also one of the seven, and of him we find that he went to Samaria where he gathered a large following "when they heard him and saw the signs which he did." (Acts 8:6) There seems little doubt here that these two of the seven had conferred upon them special powers by the hands of the apostles.

(2) The Apostles at Samaria. (Acts 8:4-24) The phenomenal success of Philip's work in Samaria soon became known in Jerusalem, and the apostles sent Peter and John. Their immediate action was to pray that the Holy Spirit might be received by the Samaritans. Then we have this interesting note:

> For it had not yet fallen on any of them, but they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit. Now when Simon saw that the Spirit was given through the laying on of the apostles' hands, he offered them money.

We note that it was by action of all the apostles that Peter

and John went to Samaria. The intention of these two apostles was that the Samaritans should receive the Holy Spirit. They knew that this power did not reside in Philip, and this is further borne out by the fact that Simon tried to buy this power from the apostles, but not from Philip. Simon had been with Philip for some time. "After being baptized he continued with Philip. And seeing signs and great miracles performed, he was amazed." He would therefore have ample knowledge of the power of the Holy Spirit as far as it was related to Philip.

(3) The Twelve Men in Ephesus and Paul. (Acts 19:1-7) Paul, upon meeting with a group of twelve disciples who undoubtedly had been won to Christ by the preaching of Apollos, asked if they had received the Holy Spirit when they believed. Receiving a negative answer, he then asked, "Into what then were you baptized?" When they told him it was into John's baptism, Paul immediately made it clear that this was merely the baptism of repentance and that they were to believe on Jesus. Upon this they were baptized "in the name of the Lord Jesus." This action on their part would place them in the same position as those on the day of Pentecost who were baptized and received the gift of the Holy Spirit. When this action had been completed, Paul laid his hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit and "they spoke with tongues and prophesied." Paul, having corrected what was wrong, imparted unto them this special gift of the Spirit that was within the power of the apostles to impart.

(4) The Case of Timothy. (2 Timothy 1:6) "Hence I remind you to rekindle the gift of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands." Here we have clearly stated the thing that qualified Timothy to be an evangelist, regardless of who the author may be.

These spiritual gifts imparted by the hands of the apostles appear to be general in the early church. They are many and varied in their work. Paul could write to the Corinthian Church, "you are not lacking in any spiritual gift," (I Cor. 1:7) which indeed they were not judging from the list in the twelfth chapter of the epistle.

It is clear to us that the apostles, those only who were baptized by the Holy Spirit, were enabled through this power given unto them to develop the church of the Lord Christ to the limits that are defined within the Scriptures. This was the promise as Jesus had revealed it to them; and as promised, it was given only to the apostles.[1]

2. The Special Gifts of the Spirit.-- By special gifts of the Spirit, we intend to notice those spiritual gifts which were imparted by the laying on of the apostles' hands. In no case is its imparting called a baptism. It was unlike the baptism, not being connected with anything which could be seen or heard; but it was like baptism in that it enabled the recipient to speak with tongues.

In the case of Philip at Samaria, as we have noted, he did not have this power which was used by Peter and John.

---

[1]A. S. Johnson, The Holy Spirit and the Human Mind (Knoxville: Gaut-Ogden Co. Press, 1903), p. 62.

He had not been baptized in the Holy Spirit as had the apostles. The sharp and quick-eyed Simon saw immediately that it was a power residing in the apostles. He attempted to purchase this power for himself and his own selfish ends. We are left with the impression that Philip could not pass on this gift of the Spirit. In his subsequent labors, we see Philip only preaching and baptizing.

In the case of the twelve men at Ephesus upon whom Paul laid his hands, we know nothing of their subsequent activities. Here there is silence which cannot be bridged.

The Corinthian Church seems to have a wide variety of these spiritual gifts as related in the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of I Corinthians. These gifts were so numerous in this church that it became necessary for Paul to regulate their use.[1]

In the epistle of James there appears to be a reference that among the church there are elders who have these extraordinary gifts. (James 5:13-15) And in the epistle of John people are addressed who have them. (I John 2:26-27)

The view here presented is that only the apostles had the power to impart these special gifts of the Spirit. It would then be true that, when the last apostle died, this power to give spiritual gifts would have ceased.[2] We should then expect that, as the church passed from the Apostolic age, these spiritual gifts would cease in the church. It will be

---

[1]I Cor. 12:1-31; 13; 14:1-40.

[2]Johnson, op. cit., p. 70.

interesting to see if this is really true.

3. The Holy Spirit of Promise to All Who Obey the Gospel.-- This operation of the Spirit is by far the most important, being promised to all as a blessing in connection with the remission of sins.

> Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are afar off, every one whom the Lord our God calls to him. (Acts 2:38-39)

In all cases of those answering the call of God and believing in Jesus Christ as his son, the people were baptized. Even in the case of the household of Cornelius when they had been baptized in the Holy Spirit, and after it had happened, Peter required their baptism in water. This promise can be received by those who believe and accept Christ as Lord. Peter makes this clear when he says, "And we are witnesses of these things, and so is the Holy Spirit whom God has given to those who obey him." (Acts 5:32)

Since we have made much of the other two operations of the Holy Spirit as being a promise to the apostles by Jesus, and since one might receive the impression in reading the gospels that the promise of the Holy Spirit was to the apostles alone and for their day, we hasten to show that Jesus did speak of the Holy Spirit as being the possession of others than the apostles and for another time than their time. Jesus makes it clear that the mission of the Holy Spirit was in a real sense to be to all believers and all ages. He was to be received by him "who believes in me," including more than the

apostles. (John 7:38-39) The Holy Spirit was to "convict the world," and the inference is that comfort would follow conviction. (John 16:7-11) He was to be the "Spirit of truth" and this could not be confined to twelve men. (John 14:17) He was to be "with you forever"; and since the apostles would all die, the Holy Spirit would need to work through others than the apostles.

Jesus had much to say about the Kingdom of God and those who were to be a part of or enter into it. It was a new way of life and required a new man to enter, but this newness was something within the scope of every man. His last words to his apostles were that this gospel was to be preached to all men. It is certain that he conceived the new life as an operation of the Holy Spirit as he talked with Nicodemus.

> The conversation with Nicodemus asserts the principle of the new birth, tracing the beginning of the spiritual life in men to the Spirit of God, and apparently connecting the birth of the Spirit with the future sacrament of Christian Baptism.[1]

Swete here refers to the later statement of Jesus in Matthew 28:19: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." There are many who feel that this is a baptismal formula that was added later to the gospel record. Even if this were true, it would indicate that in the apostolic period the understanding of the church was that the Spirit was received at baptism. This point does not need to be labored for Peter, in his sermon at Pentecost, said that

---

[1]Swete, op. cit., p. 408.

in so many words: "and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:38) Not only so but he said it was for those who were "far off," which we feel must mean in time even unto now because it is for "everyone whom the Lord our God calls to him." In most cases those baptized were baptized in "the name of the Lord Jesus," but the result is the same in all cases. One such case is related in Acts 19:1-6. Here the twelve men that Paul contacted did not know anything about the Holy Spirit having been baptized with John's baptism. "And Paul said, 'John baptized with the baptism of repentance, telling the people to believe in the one who was to come after him, that is, Jesus.' On hearing this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts 19:4) Of this incident H. Cunliffe-Jones says:

> To confess Jesus as Lord and to have received the Holy Spirit are one and the same thing. We are told the story in Acts 19:1-6. The full meaning of Christian faith was hidden from them. Baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus meant the coming of the Holy Spirit in power. The gift of the Spirit is the distinctive thing in the corporate life of the Christian Church.[1]

If it is thought that the Acts of the Apostles is a sort of secondary source, the same belief and teaching can be found in the writings of Paul which should satisfy the most critical of critics. R. Birch Hoyle says of Paul:

> The central themes of Paul's message which make it a 'gospel' and his sublimest religious experiences meet and mingle in baptism. (cf. Gal. 3:26; Rom. 6:3-10; I Cor. 6:11; Col. 2:12; 3:1-4.)[2]

---

[1]H. Cunliffe-Jones, The Holy Spirit (London: Independent Press, Ltd., 1943), p. 18.

[2]R. Birch Hoyle, The Holy Spirit and St. Paul (London: Hodder & Co., 1927), p. 154.

Of Romans 6:3-10 he says:

> This dying with Christ and resurrection with Him is fully drawn out in baptism. In His death Jesus Christ makes us participate in His life; we only live in Him so far as we die in Him.[1]

To this H. B. Swete also agrees as he says:

> To be baptized "into the name . . . of the Holy Spirit" is to be placed in a position of lifelong dependence upon the Divine Spirit, and consecration to the service which He inspires.[2]

The terms, "in spirit," "in holy Spirit," which parallel the ever-recurring "in Christ Jesus" and "in the Lord" as used by Paul, are described by R. Birch Hoyle:

> In this usage the Spirit is regarded as mediating the union of believers with Christ and with one another within the Church. The Spirit of Christ and of the believers mutually interpenetrate, so that each is in the other, as air may surround and penetrate a man (Rom. 8:1,11; I Cor. 3:16; 6:19; Gal. 2:20).
>
> At baptism believers were refreshed and merged their several peculiarities, racial, social, sexual, into a higher unity, the one body, in which the Spirit dwells, thereby making it a temple and dwelling place of God (I Cor. 12:13; II Cor. 13:14; Phil. 2:1; Eph. 4:4; 2:18,22).[3]

We have developed the thesis that in the early church the apostles, including Paul, received the baptism of the Holy Spirit with its attendant special powers (the household of Cornelius being an exception since it was for a specially stated purpose); that the special gift of the spirit by the laying on of the apostles' hands gave spiritual gifts that were widespread in the church; and that all believers received

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Swete, op. cit., p. 409.

[3] Hoyle, "Holy Spirit," Encyclopedia of Religions and Ethics, op. cit., p. 794.

the gift of the spirit by their entrance into Christ by baptism.

It now becomes our purpose to examine the nature of the church as guided by the Holy Spirit as well as the gift of the Spirit in those who made up that church. One thing must be borne in mind as we consider this: that is, that the Holy Spirit in the thinking of the early church was identified with Christ because it was thus that the Lord could both dwell in the church, his "body," and be active in the lives of his believers.[1] (Rom. 8:9-10)

The early church cannot be thought of as we think of it now, "as an institution to which men attach themselves, and which exercises certain rights over them."[2] It was more of a community or colony. Class distinctions are not to be observed as we note Paul censuring the Corinthian Church in allowing the rich to be eating apart from the poor (I Cor. 11:29 f.); and James made it a mark of unchristian action to favor those of fine apparel (James 2:1-6). This effect of being one was that of the Spirit as we note what Paul says:

> For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we were all bsptized into one body -- Jews or Greeks, slaves or free -- and all were made to drink of one Spirit.
> (I Cor. 12:12-13)

In the church each was an individual personality, and this must have meant much in the days when class distinctions

---

[1]Swete, op. cit., p. 409.

[2]E. F. Scott, Man and Society in the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946), p. 120.

counted for so much; yet each person was a part of the community. "His thought of the community was inseparable from that of his own personality, of which he was vividly conscious when all were met together as brethren in Christ."[1] After noting that the Spirit is the bond of catholic unity (Eph. 4:34; 2:18; Phil. 2:1) and the source of ministerial gifts (Eph. 4:7-12; II Tim. 1:6-7), Swete says:

> The same divine gift which sanctifies and perfects the individual member of Christ, is the bond of corporate unity and the source and support of the common life which animates the whole body of the church.[2]

We are dealing here with the conflicting views that the Spirit is the possession of the church as over against the idea that it is the possession of the individual. These conflicting views are the basis of a great deal of the confusion of our present conception of the Holy Spirit. The issue is best stated in this manner: Does the Spirit operate through the individual in a special way or is the Spirit the possession of the church and dispensed by the church only? We see a great many free lance divine healers today. Are they justified from the life of the early church?

Nowhere in the early church do we find those who received the gift of the Spirit upon their baptism performing special acts of healing, prophesying or talking in tongues, unless apostles' hands are laid upon them. We are therefore dealing with that gift of the Spirit that comes to all those

---

[1] Ibid., p. 120.

[2] Swete, op. cit., p. 410.

who have come "into Christ." We can note that always the Spirit resided in the church and individuals received it through the church. One who was a convert and was baptized at that moment received the Spirit. The conclusion to this observation is that the Spirit is inoperative aside from the church.[1]

Prophecy was the most distinctive feature of the early church along with its tremendous enthusiasm; in fact, the former was largely responsible for the latter. We see that men and women have a message they believe has come to them from God. There was the danger here of individualism, a person believing he had direct access to God, and that his particular gift was more important than anything else.[2] This very danger was realized in the Corinthian Church as we have noted. It is of interest here to note the nine gifts mentioned by Paul in I Cor. 12:8-10. Five are concerned with the proclamation of the gospel. They are utterance of wisdom, utterance of knowledge, prophecy, interpretation of tongues, and ability to distinguish between spirits. The purpose of the latter would aid in the detection of false spirits which was a recognized need of that day.[3] (I John 4:1) Paul found the answer to this problem in love, which was to bind all together, as he goes on to develop the "still more excellent way" in the

---

[1]E. F. Scott, op. cit., p. 121.

[2]K. S. Latourette, A History of the Expansion of Christianity, Vol. I (New York: Harper & Bros., 1937), p. 61.

[3]Hoven, op. cit., p. 86.

thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians.

Since the "gift of the spirit" was the possession of all, it is of interest to set in parallel columns what Paul says of love and what he says of the fruit of the spirit:

Love is patient and kind; love is not jealous or boastful; it is not arrogant or rude. Love does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; it does not rejoice at wrong, but rejoices in the right. Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things. (I Cor. 13:4-7)	But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control, against such there is no law. And those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires. If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit. Let us have no self-conceit, no provoking of one another, no envy of one another. (Gal. 5:22-25)

The similarity is striking when the two passages are taken as a whole. Here certainly is a mark of Christian maturity and not childishness.

John speaks of this personal spiritual life in the Christian as an anointing and an inward possession.[1] The Spirit gave an inner witness to each believer that he was in true communion with God. He makes it plain that this witness is to the Son in which the three witnesses of God agree, "the Spirit, the water, and the blood." "The Spirit thus speaks separately to every man, but it is still conceived as mediated by the community."[2]

Thus it is clearly seen that the early church was not only conscious of the dangers of individualism and its disruptive influence upon the body, but also had the cure for

---

[1]I John 2:20,27; 4:13; 5:6-12.

[2]Scott, op. cit., p. 122.

this problem. We can agree with Cunliffe-Jones when he says:

> The very diversity of the gifts of the Holy Spirit may disrupt the Body of Christ unless they are bound into one and subordinated to the common good. And the only power which can do this is love -- I Cor. 13. This is a portrait not only of Jesus, but of what Christians can become because "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us." (Rom. 5:5)[1]

It is not a question of either-or; the church having possession of the Holy Spirit, or the individual having possession. The early Christian had received the Spirit to regenerate and restore his personal life, to aid him in his struggle against the desires of the flesh in order that he might be raised to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. He was a member of the community; and the more he was united with Christ, the more he would be united with Christ's people. "The Church was his larger self, and the Spirit which moved in it was present also in him as an individual.[2]

Yet from the early church until this day, there have been those who have acted as individuals separated from the body of Christ, perpetuating a sort of anarchy in Christianity that has been one of its chief problems, as it is today. It is possible to rationalize this position by the use of the Scriptures where the whole intent and view of these Scriptures have not been used. As we shall see, from time to time these movements spring up and pass away, always in opposition to the other view that the church has sole possession of the Spirit.

---

[1]Cunliffe-Jones, op. cit., p. 74.

[2]Scott, op. cit., p. 123.

We have yet to note the trend taken by the other view, i.e. that the church had possession of the Holy Spirit. It is of interest to note the words of E. F. Scott on this:

> At a later time the conception was carried out to its logical issue, and the church claimed the right to guard and dispense its own possession. To those whom it ordained as its leaders, it delegated the heavenly power which belonged theoretically to all. As the lawful representatives of the church they exercised the spiritual gifts, and their acts were supposed to carry with them divine sanction. This, however, was a perversion of the original idea. Paul had asserted boldly that where the Spirit is there is liberty (II Cor. 3:11), but the doctrine was now established that the Spirit, bestowed officially on the priesthood of the church, there went an authority, to which the ordinary Christian must submit himself.[1]

We feel constrained to say that both ideas are a perversion of the original idea. The Spirit was given to the baptized believer in Christ and also resided in and guided the church. The gift of the Holy Spirit has meaning only as a witness to the risen and reigning Christ. This witness becomes an essential part of the life of the Christian and the church, not separate from one another, but bound together as one body. This is undoubtedly the view of the early church and the test that it put upon all words that were spoken as seen from this: "By this you know the Spirit of God; every spirit which confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God." (I John 4:2) We wish also to note what is said by Swete:

> The great purpose of Christian prophecy was to bear witness of Jesus Christ (Rev. 19:10). The Spirit of prophecy was the Spirit of witness which belonged to the church as a whole (John 15:26; Acts 1:8), but was specially manifested in the mission of the prophetic order. As the Church grew in knowledge and faith, it became increasingly able to bear its witness through the regular

---

[1] Ibid., p. 122.

> ministry and in the lives of its members generally. Prophecies therefore, in the sense of specially inspired utterances, gradually ceased in the Church, the place of the prophet being taken partly by the teaching bishop or presbyter, partly by the testimony which every well-instructed believer bears by word or act to the name of the Lord Jesus. There is in the history of the Church an increasing advance towards the ideal state when "all the Lord's people" shall be "prophets" in this sense.[1]

This view not only confirms the point we had been presenting but also an earlier view that the special gifts of the spirit ceased after the period of the early church.

When we think of the church as a colony, we must at once realize that in this sense it has the spirit of another country. The Spirit came with Jesus, as did also the church. In the New Testament we have only the one concept of the church: it is one, universal. It is well expressed in this word of John Knox:

> The true unity of the church is the "Communion of the Holy Spirit" -- a unity not to be imposed from above, or indeed to be imposed at all since it is already there. Where the Spirit is there is the Church; and where the Church is, there is the Spirit. We can produce neither the one nor the other; both are God's gift to all who will receive the Christ in humility and in faith.[2]

Thus the Spirit not only inhabits the church, but it also binds its members together into a unity. Since Christ loved the church and died for it (Eph. 5:25), God's love is a concrete, living, spiritual reality in the church.

---

[1]H. B. Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church (New York: Macmillan Co., 1909), pp. 378-9.

[2]John Knox, Chapters in the Life of Paul (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950), p. 139.

CHAPTER V

THE HOLY SPIRIT TO THE CREED OF NICAEA

The period following the first century was one in which the church grew by leaps and bounds. It was drawing into its fellowship people of all races, and these were being transformed into a new life. Persecution came in greater or less degrees from time to time. It was becoming much more highly organized and the assumption was that all authority was vested in the church, whereas in the previous age it was guided by the free activity of the Spirit, which dwelt in the hearts of all believers.[1] Possibly for the reason that the leaders are telling us the story rather than the people, we have such a dearth of material as to the work of the Holy Spirit in this period. There is much discussion issuing in creeds and symbols and many confessions. "There is a striking disproportion between the place of the Holy Spirit in the formularies of the Church and in its religious experience."[2]

The first writer that we note in this period is Clement of Rome, 95 A.D. In his Epistle to the Corinthians he writes: "a deep peace was vouchsafed to all . . . and there came on all a full outpouring of the Holy Spirit." (11.2) But he

---

[1]E. F. Scott, The Purpose of the Gospels (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), p. 17.

[2]Hoyle, "Holy Spirit," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, op. cit., p. 796.

does not go on to amplify just what is meant by this or mention any results of this outpouring. The partisan spirit that existed in the church in Paul's day seems to have persisted, and he pleads for the "unity of the Spirit," saying:

> Why are there among you these strifes and outbreakings of passion and factions and divisions and wars? Have we not one God, and one Christ, and one Spirit of grace that was poured upon us, and one calling in Christ? (46.5 f.)

He thinks of the Scriptures as being inspired by the Holy Spirit, but this is in reference to the Old Testament. (13.1; 16.2) He feels that Paul wrote to them under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. (47.3) But he has nothing at all to say about the work of the Holy Spirit in the believers.[1] He says later in this letter concerning the apostles:

> And so, as they preached in the country and in the towns, they appointed their first-fruits (having proved them by the Spirit) to be bishops and deacons of them that should believe. And this is no novelty, for of old it had been written concerning bishops and deacons; for the Scripture says in one place, "I will set up their bishops in righteousness, and their deacons in faith." (Is. lx. 17)[2]

But according to the Masoretic Text, this passage reads thus: "I will also make thy officers peace, and righteousness thy magistrates."[3] This is a far different rendering of this Scripture, and it is hard to understand just why it was used by Clement. It is possible that, since he had attributed the

---

[1]Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, op. cit., p. 12.

[2]Henry Bettenson, ed., Documents of the Christian Church (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 89.

[3]The Holy Scriptures, A New Translation (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1948), p. 552.

inspiration of the Old Testament to the Holy Spirit, he desired to place the strength of the Holy Spirit behind his novel opinion of bishops and deacons. He goes on in his next paragraph (xliv) to mention that the Lord had disclosed the dangers of the office of a bishop and directed them to appoint the above mentioned officers, "and after a time made provision that on their death other approved men should succeed to their ministry . . . ." Thus it appears in the opinion of Clement that, through the action of the Holy Spirit and the Lord, the authority within the church was transferred to a select set of officers.

Some twenty years after Clement, we find Ignatius as Bishop of Antioch (ca. 112). In his letter to Philadelphia, he says: "When I was in your midst I cried aloud, I spake with a great voice, the voice of God, 'Give heed to the Bishop and the presbytery and deacons . . . ." (Phil. vii) He here appears to think of himself, if not of all bishops, as being moved by the Spirit and speaking as the Spirit gave him utterance.[1] He has more to say of the Spirit and the believer than does Clement, especially in that the Holy Spirit is the moving force in their coming into Christ. He speaks of them as

> stones of the Temple, prepared beforehand for a building of God the Father, hoisted aloft by the engine of Jesus Christ, His Cross; using the Holy Spirit for a rope, while your faith is your windlass, and your love the way that leads to God. Not till the rope has been attached can the work proceed of lifting the individual life through faith and love.[2]

---

[1]Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, op. cit., p. 14.

[2]Ibid., p. 15.

In other places he speaks of the "spiritual gift that you have received" and "the Spirit poured out from the rich Lord who is its source" and "in the baptized, as in Christ himself, the body is the vessel of the Spirit; the human spirit is inhabited by the Divine." (Phil. 1.2; 7.3; 11.9)[1] Thus do we find many statements in Ignatius that are similar to those of the New Testament and some that are his own fancy and interpretation, but all having to do with the gift of the spirit that is given to all Christians.

There is some light thrown on our question from the Didache. Bettenson tells us that this writing was discovered at Constantinople in 1875 and that its date, authorship, and origin are unknown. However, he lists it under this caption: "A Church order of the Second Century."[2] From that portion dealing with regulations about the ministry (XI) the test of prophets is given.

> Now, as concerning the apostles and prophets, according to the teaching of the gospel, so do ye; and let every apostle that cometh to you be received as the Lord; and he shall stay but one day, and, if need be the next day also; but if he stay three days he is a false prophet.

Again,

> Every prophet that teacheth the truth, if he doeth not the things that he teacheth, is a false prophet.

And again,

> But whosoever shall say in spirit, "Give me money, or other things," ye shall not listen to him, but if he bid you give for others that are in need, let no man judge him.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18 f.

[2] Bettenson, op. cit., p. 90.

It is evident from the above that, in those churches to which the Didache was addressed, the only test of a prophet was that of personal character. We can thus see that the "gift of discerning spirits," which was complementary to that of "prophecy" (I Cor. 12:10), has passed from these churches. Swete places the date of the Didache as the fifth decade of the second century and as either from the churches in the Syrian hills or far up the Nile. In both cases the conditions show a very primitive situation. He also notes that the danger point has shifted from excessive enthusiasm in Paul's time to false prophets by 150 A.D. Of this he says, "The charismatic ministry is evidently coming to its end."[1]

Although Gnosticism did not involve an attack on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the fight against it by Christianity did cause the church to concentrate on other matters and take measures that affected the life of the church which in a very large degree influenced, or at least caused, the work of the Holy Spirit to become a matter of indifference. Gnosticism was a real threat to the church because of the loose organization that obtained as well as its undefined theology.

> The church overcame the danger; but at the cost of the development of a rigidity of organization, creed, and government which rendered the condition of the church at the close of the second century a striking contrast to that of the beginning.[2]

---

[1]Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, op. cit., p. 19 f.

[2]W. Walker, A History of the Christian Church (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), p. 53.

Harnack shows that this condition tended to identify Christianity with a system of faith which became incomprehensible to the people who became oppressed under the system and were always referred to the authority.[1] This shift in interest was certainly felt by the constituency of the church and the rigid government and super authority went counter to their desires and understanding.

To a large extent the Montanist movement was a protest against this tighter church rule. Eusebius says of Montanus:

> He was one of the recent converts, and he became possessed of a spirit, and suddenly began to rave in a kind of ecstatic trance, and to babble in a jargon, prophesying in a manner contrary to the custom of the Church which had been handed down by tradition from the earliest times. (Euseb. H. E. V. 16.7)[2]

The obvious intent to discredit the movement is seen in this statement, for note the mention of "recent convert" and "contrary to the custom of the Church." Our difficulty here is that our sources of Montanism have been largely anti-montanist in nature, and a clear picture of what they really taught and practiced is not possible. At least we know that the Holy Spirit was central in their teaching and what appears is like the Corinthian Church of Paul's day. That it is the same is unlikely since allowance must be made for the backwardness of a rural community and the temperament of the natives of Phrygia.[3] But it is a real attempt to get back to the early

---

[1]Adolph Harnack, Outline of the History of Dogma (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1893), trans. E. K. Mitchell, p. 87.

[2]Bettenson, op. cit., p. 108.

[3]Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, op. cit., p. 70.

church as a means of reform of the second century church. The reforming individualists find the organized church solidly against them with a decided defeat for the ideal of the church as a colony.

We have to note next the Greek Apologists. There were many things they were interested in, and only incidentally do we find them saying anything about the Holy Spirit. Justin Martyr in 138 wrote:

> Day by day some are being made disciples in the name of His Christ, and leave the way of error; and such persons receive, each of them, gifts according to their meetness, being illuminated through the name of this same Christ; for one receives the Spirit of understanding, and another the Spirit of counsel or strength or healing or foresight or teaching or of the fear of God. (Trypho 39)[2]

This list in only a limited degree resembles that in Paul's letter to the Corinthians, but it does indicate that there was some understanding of the gift of the spirit to the believer. But there was a much greater emphasis placed on the idea of what he termed "the prophetic Spirit." (Apolo. 1.6) To get the meaning of this, let us quote him again: "and in the name of the Holy Spirit, who by the prophets announced beforehand all the things concerning Christ." (Apolo. 1.61)[2]

The interest of the Apologists was in establishing the Old Testament as the divine word of God and to show by the prophecies that Jesus was the Christ. Personal religious experience and the historical Jesus were somewhat of a problem

---

[1] Ibid., p. 34.

[2] J. Armitage Robinson, St. Irenaeus, The Apostolic Preaching (New York: Macmillan Co., 1920), p. 30.

to them.

Athenagoras, in his plea for Christians to Marcus Aurelius, 175 A.D., said:

> Moreover, the Holy Spirit that works in those that deliver prophetic utterances we affirm to be an effluence of God, flowing forth and returning to Him like a ray of sun. (Leg. 2)[1]

However, both Athenagoras and Justin Martyr were far more zealous in developing a doctrine of the Logos, although we do note these marks of understanding of the Holy Spirit.

Irenaeus shared the idea of the "prophetic Spirit" we have noted above in Justin Martyr. He has this to say of the Holy Spirit:

> . . . and who in the end of the times was poured out in a new way upon mankind in all the earth, renewing man unto God. (Demonstration 6)[2]

Until the close of the second century we have been able to trace some idea of the prophetic office, different than that of the New Testament, it is true. Yet some resemblance is there. By the close of the second century, the prophets had disappeared; but until that time, there is some visible demonstration of the Spirit's rule and guidance of the church.[3]

Our historical survey of this period has demonstrated the thesis of the former chapter, namely, that the special gifts of the Spirit were for the early period (childhood) of

---

[1]Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, op. cit., p. 42.

[2]Robinson, op. cit., p. 75.

[3]Hoyle, "The Holy Spirit," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, op. cit., p. 799.

the church. We need to point out that the New Testament was formed during this sub-apostolic period and was available as a guide to the church. The fact that it was not used as such does not militate against the fact that it was there for use.

Harnack points out that the belief in the Holy Spirit was in the church, but just what it was had become obscure. This is especially noticeable after the decline of Montanism and the retiring of the '*spiritus ecclesia*.' The apologists, in attempting to work out a scientific theology, were baffled by the Holy Spirit and did not know what to do with it.[1] It is his studied opinion that the work of the Holy Spirit had ceased in any effective way before the close of the second century. He goes on to show that in the time of Origen and Tertullian there seemed to be no very concrete interest by Christians in the doctrine. It was thought of as just a power. Where it was thought of in a personal way, it was a secondary matter. Even up to the time of the trinitarian creed-making, it was just a word.[2] Thus is portrayed the sad story of the work of the Holy Spirit in the period following the establishment of the church by the apostles. That which had lead them so gloriously was now but a mere word in the church.

---

[1]Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

[2]*Ibid.*, p. 267.

CHAPTER VI

THE HOLY SPIRIT FROM NICAEA TO THE REFORMATION

From the standpoint of our thesis, we enter into our most barren period, since the work of the Holy Spirit is scarcely in the thinking of the church. It is needful to note the main happenings, since they will shed light on the next period.

This is shown very clearly as we study the creeds that came into being around 325 (Nicaea) and following. We intend to note only that portion about the Holy Spirit.

There are two so-called Apostles' Creeds; origin and author are not known for sure, except they thought in the fourth century that it had been formulated by the apostles in Jerusalem.

(1) The Old Roman Creed has thirteen articles, the ninth one being: "I believe in . . . And in the Holy Ghost."

(2) A Gallican Creed of the sixth century was extracted from a sermon of Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, 503-43. It has twelve articles; the ninth one is: "I believe in the Holy Ghost."[1]

There are three "Nicene" creeds that have some prominence which we will note briefly.

---

[1]Bettenson, op. cit., p. 34 f. There is a note that says the Apostles' Creed as we know it now was found in 750 A.D. The Old Roman Creed was the creed of Marcellus (ca. 340), given to Julius, Bishop of Rome, by him.

(1) The Creed of Caesarea was presented to the council of Nicaea by Eusebius of Caesarea for adoption, it being the creed of his church. The portion about the Holy Spirit runs: "We believe also in one Holy Spirit."

(2) Then there was the Creed of Nicaea. Much of the creed offered by Eusebius was acceptable, but some additions and alterations were made by the council. The portion that deals with the Holy Spirit came out thus: "And in the Holy Spirit."

(3) The Nicene Creed was approved at Constantinople in 381 and at the council of Chalcedon, 451. The portion dealing with the Holy Spirit is now extended:

> And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and the Life-giver, that proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and Son is worshiped together and glorified together, who spake through the prophets.[1]

Not much is there; the idea of the Holy Spirit is just a word. Not until the Nicene Creed is revised at Chalcedon do we find a change, and this is one of doctrine and not the work of the Holy Spirit. There is an interesting comment on this idea of the "Procession" in Augustine:

> So the Father is Himself the True Origin of the Son, who is the Truth, and the Son is the Truth, originating from the True Father, and the Holy Spirit is Goodness, shed abroad from the Good Father and the Good Son. (Sermon xxi, par. 18. ed. Schaff)[2]

The Eastern Church could not accept the procession of the Holy Spirit through both Father and Son, but only through the

---

[1]*Ibid.*, pp. 35-37.

[2]Slattery, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

Father. This was the main cause of the break between East and West.

Since Augustine came under the powerful preaching of Ambrose in Milan, and indeed was baptized by him, it is an illuminating experience to hear Ambrose speak (374 A.D.):

> There are some who because we are baptised with water and the Spirit, think that there is no difference in the offices of water and the Spirit, and therefore think that they do not differ in nature. Nor do they observe that we are buried in the element of water that we may rise again renewed by the Spirit. For in the water is the representation of death, in the Spirit is the pledge of life, that the body of sin may die through the water, which encloses the body as it were in a kind of tomb, that we, by the power of the Spirit may be renewed from the death of sin, being born again in God. (On the Holy Spirit I. vi)[1]

Here is a message very much on the order of the teachings of Paul in Romans 6:1-8. It must have had a powerful influence upon Augustine. The influence of Monica, his mother, certainly indicates some knowledge of the workings of the Holy Spirit. It was the work of Augustine that laid the foundation of the idea of grace in the west, which he held to be the activity of the Holy Spirit. But this was bound up with his doctrine of the church and the sacraments; it belonged to the church.[2]

From this it is evident that the work of the Holy Spirit has been placed within the sacraments of the church and can be administered only by the church. But the voice

---

[1]Ibid., p. 137.

[2]H. W. Robinson, "The Holy Spirit," Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed., Vol. 11 (New York: The Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1936), p. 686.

of Augustine is not the only one teaching this. Note the words of Cyril of Jerusalem in his Catechetical Lectures (350-86):

> The Holy Spirit . . . who illuminates the souls of the just, and supplies the force which purifies or strengthens according to the need; who bestows all the varied graces and virtues of Christian life, directly and through the appointed channels of the ordinances and sacraments of the Church the good Sanctifier and Ally and Teacher of the Church, the true Enlightener. (Cat. XVI 24)[1]

Not only do we have the Holy Spirit as the possession of the church, but we have the work of the Spirit being directed by the church entirely.

That this is the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church today seems quite certain. J. Forget lists twelve Charismata, as given in I Cor. 12:6-11; 28-31; Rom. 12:6-8, where twelve are mentioned and then classifies them into four groups. He then says:

> St. Paul was careful to restrict authoritatively the use of these charismata within the ends for which they were bestowed, and thus insisted upon their subordination to the power of the hierarchy.[2]

It seems that without a doubt the entire work of the Holy Spirit is in the hands of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church and chiefly dispensed to believers through the sacraments. This control of the Holy Spirit is best seen in the action of the Council of Trent (1545-63). Here was

---

[1]J. F. Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine, 8th ed. (London: Thethuen & Co., 1942), p. 207.

[2]J. Forget, "Holy Ghost," The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: Robert Appleton Co., 1910), Vol. VII, p. 413 f.

claimed the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit for the traditions of the church which were given equal authority with the Scriptures, plus the Apocrypha. The reason for this action was based upon the infusion of rightecusness through the Holy Spirit, mediated by the whole system of the church.[1] This condition obtained up to the period of the Reformation and indeed was to a great extent one of the causes for the Reformation. One could not imagine a condition where the work of the Holy Spirit could be further removed from the believers than here pictured as a historical process in time. There were protests all through the centuries, as there were also reform movements; but in all cases the protestants or reformers were either swallowed up by the church or silenced. Such was the case with Montanism and Jacobism. But the Lollards in England, who contrasted the Priesthood of Rome with that of the Holy Spirit, were eliminated to a large extent by force.[2]

However the mysticism of the Middle Ages was under way by 1500; and with its desire for a closer fellowship with God, it was actually blazing the way toward a realization of the activity of the Holy Spirit. All of the reformers came into contact with it to a greater or less degree.

---

[1]H. W. Robinson, op. cit., p. 685 f.

[2]G. F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946), p. 4.

CHAPTER VII

REDISCOVERY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT BY THE REFORMATION

The Reformation was brought about by a combination of many circumstances, events and movements. No one of these can be singled out as the chief cause. The Renaissance, or as it is termed, "the revival of learning," wherein the classics including the Bible were brought to the attention of man, was certainly a primary cause. The abuses of the Roman Catholic Church was also a primary cause. One need not labor this point nor appear to be intolerant by classifying these abuses as a cause of the Reformation. The fact that within the Roman Catholic Church there was a counter-reformation would appear to be evidence enough to establish these abuses as a major cause of the Reformation.

In any case it is not our purpose to emphasize nor to defend the Reformation, but to examine the factors related to the work of the Holy Spirit that came out of the period covered by the Reformation. The circulation of the Bible in the vernacular, so that all might read and understand, appears to us to be that which affects our investigation the most.

There is a statement from Martin Luther concerning the sacrament of Ordination in the Roman Catholic Church which is very revealing:

> This is the source of detestable tyranny over the laity by the clergy who, relying on the external anointing

> of their hands, the tonsure and the vestments, not only exalt themselves above lay Christians, anointed by the Holy Spirit, but even regard them as dogs, unworthy to be included with them in the church . . . (Weimar Ausgabe, VI., p. 563 f.)[1]

Undoubtedly this has the marks of having been written under great emotional stress and, consequently, contains some rather overdrawn ideas. But it does indicate the belief that the priesthood considered themselves as in entire possession of the Holy Spirit and looked down upon others from their lofty height. This factor appears to be one of the dangers that are constantly with us, for be it noted that Paul in his writings to the Galations and the Corinthians is dealing with this very source of party spirit and the breaking up of the fellowship in the early church.

In contradistinction to this we have the words of Luther in the Shorter-Catechism on the work of the Holy Spirit. In answer to the question as to what it means to believe in the Holy Ghost, he says:

> I believe that I cannot of my own understanding and strength believe in or come to Jesus Christ my Lord, but that the Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, and illuminated me with His gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in the true faith, just as He calls, gathers together, illuminates, sanctifies, and preserves in Jesus Christ all Christendom throughout the earth in the one true faith; . . . .[2]

From this statement it is readily seen that the Gospel is the agency of operation and activity of the Holy Spirit. The "true faith" and all that follows its reception as a

---

[1]Roland Bainton, Here I Stand (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950), p. 138.

[2]Bettenson, op. cit., p. 291.

logical consequence is a gift of the Holy Spirit, which operates through the Word (gospel).[1] It is evident that Luther's intention is to set the Word free from its imprisonment of the past ages. He makes much of the inner witness of the Spirit to man upon which man can rely:

> Our theology (knowledge of God) is certain, because it puts us outside ourselves; I do not need rely upon my conscience, my senses, and my doing, but I rely upon the divine promise and truth which never deceived. (Weimar Ausgabe 40, I; 589,8)[2]

Man's response to the witness that has never failed and is always reliable gives to his faith a sure foundation. This inner witness through the Word is the activity of God's Spirit. It is not controlled by a church or any group of humans but is the direct action of God through his Spirit.

The rediscovery of the Holy Spirit and the liberation through the preaching of the Word in a most active and enthusiastic manner by Luther and his supporters led to excesses and abuses. By 1527 Erasmus, whose desire and message was the freedom of the spirit, was doubtful of the wisdom of his message. He saw in the reformers something far different than that which he envisioned of the Spirit and went so far as to say the reformers were inspired by the spirit of folly or even the spirit of Satan.[3] He evidently had in mind those like the Zwickau prophets who had come under the influence of

---

[1]H. W. Robinson, op. cit., p. 686.

[2]W. Pauck, The Heritage of the Reformation (Chicago: The Modern Franklin Co., 1950), p. 170.

[3]Nuttall, op. cit., p. 5.

the Lutherans but who had gotten out of hand, as it were. They went so far as to set the Spirit over against the letter of the Scriptures. They agreed with Carlstadt that the Spirit could get along without any external aids such as art or music and even the sacraments. Some extraordinary experience of the Spirit was made a test of fellowship for church membership.[1] Here again, as in the days of the early church, we have that extreme individualism coming to the fore. Benedicti, the physician of Sigismund I, voiced the position of a great many of the intellectuals of that day when he said: "It is absurd for the Lutherans to preach their possession of the Holy Spirit."[2] And, of course, something not understood is absurd to those who do not understand it.

Zwingli, who led the Reformation in Switzerland, had very little to say about the spirit, holding more to the understanding of the Scriptures. It is to be noted that in his reform movement the last thing changed from the old Roman Catholic Church was the mass because of the fact that he saw that the people did gain some spiritual strength by its reception. The most prominent feature in the dispute between Zwingli and Luther was the former's view that the flesh and the spirit are incompatible. Later on it is to be noted that Zwingli did advance beyond the position held at that time, that the Lord's Supper is only a memorial, to the one that Christ is spiritually present. And Luther's view that was

---

[1]Bainton, op. cit., p. 257.

[2]Nuttall, op. cit., p. 5.

considered to be in the nature of the magical at that time, later held that whatever the nature of the presence of Christ at the Lord's Supper, it was of no avail without faith.[1] Luther's insight that the flesh and spirit can be co-joined was in advance of his time and little appreciated until now. Luther taught that it was by a personal act of the believer that faith came, but he knew also that it was the work of the Holy Spirit and from this standpoint was a gift of God.[2]

The Reformation was in reality a revival of preaching the word of God, upon which the early reformers put great reliance. Calvin was also one who followed this main current of the Reformation. He put much reliance upon God's word that witnesses through the Spirit to the inner man.

> Let it be considered, then, as an undeniable truth, that they who have been inwardly taught by the Spirit, feel an entire acquiescence in the Scripture, and that it is self-authenticated, carrying with it its own evidence, and ought not to be made the subject of demonstration and arguments from reason; but it obtains the credit which it deserves with us by the testimony of the Spirit.[3]

If a Christian thus received the witness of the Spirit in God's word, it would be placed above the judgment of men. He held that the adequate cause for this inner witness was a revelation from heaven.[4] It is seen from this that what Calvin taught about the work of the Holy Spirit was that this

---

[1]Bainton, op. cit., p. 319.

[2]Pauck, op. cit., p. 20.

[3]John Calvin, The Institutes of the Christian Religion, Vol. I (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), p. 90.

[4]Ibid., p. 91.

inner witness of the Holy Spirit to the individual was a confirmation of the authority of the Spirit's utterance in the Scriptures. Or as Pauck puts it, "What Calvin had in mind by 'the inner witness of the Holy Spirit' was the safeguarding of the inner experience of the Word as a divine act."[1] There is no doubt that he viewed the Spirit as coming from Christ "with whom the gifts of the Spirit are deposited."[2] It is he who "baptised us with the Holy Spirit," regenerated and enlightened us and "consecrated us as holy temples of God."[3]

In the rediscovery of the work of the Holy Spirit, the main evidence was placed upon the Word, the Scriptures or the gospel. Consequently preaching the Word was the means of liberation of the Spirit as also was the circulation of the Bible. This gave a different ideal of the church, and Pauck has well given a new turn to an old expression that defines the Christian Church in the Protestant tradition as he says: "Where the Word is rightly preached <u>and heard</u>, there is the Church."[4] The further thought must be added that the conception of the "Word" is complete only in Christ; and that "heard" is in the conscience which is confronted and from which a commitment is demanded; all of which is the work of the Holy Spirit.

---

[1]Pauck, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 170.

[2]Calvin, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 591.

[3]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 594.

[4]Pauck, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 169.

Our investigation has gone far enough to establish the characteristic discovery of the work of the Holy Spirit by the early reformers, although very much more could be added and many other leaders and movements could come into our scope. It is characteristic of the Reformation that it lays emphasis on the scriptural appeal to the individual and not on the "sacramental" as controlled by a church; and the Scripture as mediated by the Holy Spirit through the word of God.

This freeing of the witness of the Spirit created grave problems. No authority is given as the official interpreter of the Scriptures. There is the danger of getting out of control, especially if private interpretation becomes the rule rather than the exception. Security and control can be so comforting and peaceful; in fact they can be so much so that the only decent thing to do is to have a funeral. This is the source of an ever present tension that persists unto this day. The early church had this tension, and Paul and John pointed to the solution which was not a funeral.

> None the less, a new principle for theology had been introduced, viz., that truth revealed in Christ admits of no external proof, but is made the inward possession of the believing mind by the convincing power of the Holy Spirit.[1]

---

[1]H. R. Mackintosh, Types of Modern Theology (London: Nisbet Co., 1947), p. 7.

CHAPTER VIII

IS THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IMPORTANT FOR TODAY?

At this point it seems best to make a brief review of the work of the Holy Spirit which we have been tracing from the earliest biblical times.

In the Old Testament "the Spirit," we have seen, is primarily that term which is descriptive of God in action. This is true not only of his creative work, but as men were chosen for special tasks, the Spirit came upon them inspiring and constraining them to enter into the divine activity in word and in deed. They were his messengers.

The new age was constantly in the message of these prophets of God. Jesus Christ, the Messiah of God, came and was endowed with the Spirit and went about performing deeds of mercy and compassion and speaking the message of salvation in full accord with the mission to which God had called him. "Jesus' whole personality was so possessed and controlled by the Spirit that his work was the work of God."[1] His work was completed by the death, burial and resurrection, after which he poured out his Spirit upon his followers. By this action they were made his Body, the church, and through the Spirit they received all the power and guidance they needed for their

---

[1]Nels F. S. Ferré, Christianity and Society (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950), p. 96.

work of witnessing of him and for carrying on the life of the church.

There were special gifts of the Spirit that guided them on special occasions in the infancy of the church; these as the special reasons for their use were fulfilled gradually passed away. But to each believer in Christ who was baptized into him, there was given the gift of the Spirit. The "gospel," as Spirit-guided men committed it to writing, became a part of the life of the church.

We then went on to trace the gradual organization of the church with its control of the Holy Spirit by the institution, and the almost complete loss of the knowledge of the work of the Holy Spirit. But by the time of the Reformation, we saw that the work of the Holy Spirit was again emerging into the life of the believer and the church.

When the average Christian today is asked concerning the Holy Spirit, the reply is very similar to that which Paul received from the twelve disciples in Ephesus: "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?" And they said, "No, we have never heard that there is a Holy Spirit." And he said, "Into what then were you baptized?" They said, "Into John's baptism." (Acts 19:2-3)

The reason for this lack of understanding of the Holy Spirit today is not entirely the same as that in the case cited above although this same reason is probably more true today than we may suppose. But we do have a vast amount of confusion in the teachings about the Holy Spirit which has

turned many away from any healthy interest in the subject. We also find gross excesses of the demonstrative work of the Holy Spirit that have been repulsive to the average Christian. On the other hand, much has been made of the goodness of man, the religious quest of man and the cultural achievements of man, so that these within themselves have become the summum bonum. We can readily agree with the observation that these do not lead men nearer to God, but on the contrary may be the most powerful means of closing the eyes of man to his need of God.[1]

The average Christian sees the church divided into many segments with a resultant loss of power in the proclamation of the gospel. He knows that there is a catholic (ecumenical)[2] movement among the churches which ebbs and flows in a very uncertain manner. It appears to lack power and direction and he is not overly enthusiastic as a result. Edward L. Parsons, in an attempt to remedy this lack of power, says:

> All these various aspects of the power from on high (worship, self-surrender, the Bible, prayer) cluster about the one great central fact of Christian experience: the Person of the Lord Christ. If the power of the Bible (the Word which speaks) is a strange and miraculous kind of thing, the power of the Christ (the Word made flesh) is more so. The great Christian fellowship, the Church throughout the world, is His Church, His Body. The Word which speaks tells of Him. The prayers which open channels for the grace of God are in His name. The Holy Spirit which guides and gives strength, which falls upon men like a flame from heaven, is His Spirit. It is He

---

[1]Cunliffe-Jones, op. cit., p. 21.

[2]We feel that the adoption of the term ecumenical and not catholic is not the only cause for the average Christian not fully understanding what the movement has as a goal, but that it is in a sense an apologetic approach that shows a lack of force as well as a lack of prophetic vision. We prefer the word catholic because it signifies a bold offensive and nothing short of this will win.

> who in the imagery of the Apocalypse comes riding the white horse and, making war in righteousness, leads the Christian hosts to victory.[1]

This victorious Christ is not, however, what the average Christian sees, nor does he hear him proclaimed seriously and sincerely as the victor. From out a maze of teachings and a tangle of parties is heard only a dim expression of this exalted Christ as the redeemer and Saviour of mankind. Surely the wrong Spirit is in control, or at least only partially is the same Spirit in control that led the early church. If the Spirit is in control of the church today, then he is the author of confusion and not of unity.

A more practical reason to show clearly the work of the Holy Spirit comes from the daily life of individuals. The average Christian can see quite readily the working of the Holy Spirit as the activity of God and of Jesus Christ; but as far as he is concerned, it seems to have so little to do with anything that he knows about in his daily life.[2] Without a doubt the thought of material gain is present; what will it do for me is the question. Our necessity is to show that nothing merely physical or material can be designated by the term "Spirit" and yet it can be a conscious experience toward his larger benefit; an experience that is both powerful and courageous that builds up the life, giving expression to free-

---

[1]E. L. Parsons, Resources in a Genuinely Christian Church, The Interseminary Series, Vol. 1, Bk. 2, ed. R. C. Miller (New York: Harper & Bros., 1946), p. 251.

[2]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 19.

dom controlled by noble ideals.[1] This in truth calls for a presentation of the work of the Holy Spirit as it witnessed of Jesus Christ and guided the early church. When believers in Christ were endued by his Spirit, they turned the world upside down in a few years' time. Based upon this early church experience, it must be shown to be the bond of community that can hold together all those who are believers in Christ of whatever race or color; it must be shown to give that realm of hopes and ideals by which man is sustained and upheld as revealed by an ever living Christ. It must be shown in a comprehensive way that it gives direction and outlook by which men's lives can be guided and controlled in the Kingdom of God as inaugurated by Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit.

If we have been at all correct in setting down the problems of our day as they relate to the work of the Holy Spirit, then it goes without saying that the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the church today is tremendously important. To think that a continued silence on this subject is to be countenanced, as it is in some places, only adds to our hopelessness in affecting the cause of righteousness today. That an indifference to the confusion and muddled teaching on the work of the Holy Spirit shall continue is almost to confess our defeat in presenting Christ as the hope of the world, its Saviour.

---

[1] E. S. Brightman, The Spiritual Life (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942), p. 14.

CHAPTER IX

THE BELIEVERS' RECEPTION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN RELATIONSHIP

We are constantly confronted with the desire of people to follow a kind of Christian way that is separated from the deeper religious convictions, usually styled doctrinal. In fact, Shirley Jackson Case, in an essay of Christian Ethics, does suggest just this. His thought is that the ethics of Jesus could be divorced from the matters of doctrine and could be thus used as the explication of a way of life that any man could choose to follow.[1] This sort of thing would do violence to the teachings of Jesus now as it did in his day. Both the rich young ruler and Nicodemus were made to see that it was not a matter of reforming or revising old religions, but it was an entire new man that was needed: a man of new loves, and born again, "born of water and the Spirit." Thus Jesus is saying that this divorce cannot be carried out. Life is not lived in isolation.

We have yet to establish any link between the non-living and the living, and it is impossible to explain the organic from the inorganic. The origin and nature of life is still an open one.[2] We have seen that in the Old Testament the "Spirit of God" is the creator of life, man's life or

---

[1]Smart, op. cit., p. 155.

[2]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 39.

spirit.[1] We have also seen that when Jesus came into the world through the activity of the Spirit he also lived a life that was in complete harmony with God and had the Spirit "without measure." Here was new life in relationship with God, knowing and doing the will of God.

One could easily say, "But this was Christ." We have a fine example that relates this to us in no uncertain way. Paul, before he was a Christian, sought desperately to live a life of righteousness under the Law. He believed that the "commandment which promised life" (Rom. 7:10) was the real way of life. At one time he thought that the Law could "make alive" (Gal. 3:21); but the more he tried the deeper he sank until he could say, "Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?" (Rom. 7:24) He goes on to show that life is gained in relationship to Christ. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death." (Rom. 8:2) This "Spirit of God" dwells in the person and makes him belong to Christ. (Rom. 8:9) "But if Christ is in you, although your bodies are dead because of sin, your spirits are alive because of righteousness." (Rom. 8:10) Being "in Christ" was Paul's solution.

The statement by Dillistone on this life of the Spirit through relation to God is significant:

> The pattern of this new life after the Spirit is the pattern revealed in the perfect Son, the pattern of life which was laid down and taken again, the pattern

---

[1]Gen. 6:17; 7:15; 2:7; Ps. 104:29-30.

of life renewed through death, the pattern of a love which gave itself to the uttermost . . . ."[1]

This is in harmony with what Paul preached as well as with his experience. It is also in keeping with John's statement, "In Him there is life."[2] This new life of the Spirit is, then, definitely in the world through the life of Christ. But while dependent upon him, it was not confined to the days of his flesh nor to those who knew him in the flesh; but it is available even in a fuller way to everybody, everywhere, and in every age, through the Holy Spirit. The terminology used is of little consequence since the New Testament makes no distinction between having God's presence with us, having Christ dwelling in us, or being filled with the Holy Spirit.[3] All of this we can accept with the understanding that the last term refers to what we have been calling the gift of the Spirit.

Of course there were conditions set to this relationship, and these naturally form the basis for the objections of Shirley Jackson Case. But when one considers that Jesus gave these conditions, the matter is placed in a different light. He began his preaching with "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." His was a call to a new manner of life, one in which God's rule and man's utter dependence upon him was the goal. It looked away from the sins of the world and also the legalism of that day. We recall that Jesus had much to say against the Pharisees on this particular point,

---

[1]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 47.

[2]John 1:12; 14:17; 6:63; 7:39; 20:22; 14:19; 11:25.

[3]D. M. Baillie, God Was In Christ (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), p. 153.

and it was his idea that his followers should exceed the righteousness which they practiced. Herein we see the conflict that was Paul's, a Pharisee, as well as the victory he knew by relating himself to the Christ.[1] That this is a difficult step is well indicated in the words spoken at the time of Paul's conversion: "It hurts you to kick against the goads." (Acts 26:14b) It also was a very conscious step and one that made a life-long impression in the mind of Paul.

We have gone only part way in this new relationship when repentance has taken place, and Jesus did not leave the matter there. It would be like being uncoupled from something and yet not coupled with anything. Paul had a personal word spoken to him -- "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest" -- and it must now be his whole-hearted acceptance of this Word and the life-giving principles that flow forth from his Spirit that will give a new relationship that is creative and redemptive. "It is as man enters into relationship with Him that the Spirit can operate effectively and dynamically to the complete transformation of heart and life."[2] It was after a period of three days that Paul, under conviction and in deep repentance, finally heard the full message from the lips of Ananias with the final plea: "And now why do you wait? Rise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on his name." (Acts 22:16) This step Paul completed as a full and conscious action on his part which placed him in a new rela-

---

[1]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 105.

[2]Ibid., p. 109.

tionship. D. M. Baillie calls this an I-Thou relationship, and his words are very pertinent:

> It must be an I-Thou relationship between the leader and his followers, giving present guidance at each moment, and the early Christians were conscious of Jesus as a living Lord with whom they were in touch. Can we have the same experience? Yes, we can, and we must, if Jesus is to be our Leader and Lord. We can have it through the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the encompassing medium or continuum in which we can have direct contact with Jesus, and it is only in that moment-to-moment contact with our Leader that we can have any knowledge of God at all.[1]

The record of the early church shows that its members consciously entered into this new relationship and that the crucified Lord was active with them. Their gospel was the life, death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ; and by baptism they entered into all of these to walk in the newness of life, his life.[2]

Does this make too much out of baptism? It could and it will if one desires to become legalistic, which in our opinion destroys the very thing Jesus had set before his disciples. It reverts to a form of pharisaism. But if one remembers that the form and symbolism are not as important as the fact, this danger is taken away. It must also be remembered that baptism into the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ was the form and symbolism that had meaning for the early church; and we find no exception to it in their records. For them there was a working of the Spirit in this whole process, and this must be maintained. Dillistone, in

---

[1]Baillie, op. cit., p. 99.

[2]Cf. I Cor. 15:1-4; Rom. 6:1-11.

speaking of the words of Jesus to Nicodemus -- "Unless one is born of water and the Spirit," and "The wind (Pneuma) blows where it wills" (John 3:5,8) -- says:

> Just as the coming of water makes new life to spring out of the earth, just as the coming of the breeze makes new energy to stir where hitherto there has been lassitude and lifelessness, so the coming of the Spirit brings to birth new life, new hope, new power, a new relationship.[1]

This symbolism, while beautiful, still gathers strength only from the fact that water and breeze must operate in the place of death. The only person who has been able to bring life out of death is the Christ; and the death, burial and resurrection symbolism carries this fact with force to the person who consciously enters into that relationship.

We are interested in the term "continuum" which Baillie used in reference to the work of the Holy Spirit through the ages. Webster gives this meaning to the word: "Anything continuous in which a fundamental common character is discernible."[2] Baillie's comment is: "So Jesus becomes our contemporary, and this direct personal relation to Him is the very essence of Christianity." This is in harmony with the fact that the Holy Spirit always bears witness of and to Jesus as the Christ, as we have seen. Baillie is saying that this continues from age to age in the same way. It is the same Christ or "common character that is discernible" through this witness that calls men into a new relation with him. We

---

[1]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 110.

[2]Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Co., Publishers, 1949), p. 180.

have certainly grown away from the idea of some external authority that imposes its will from without. We have returned to the idea of the early church which saw its life "hid with Christ in God," and this because they had been raised to a new life wherein the fruits of the Spirit took the place of that which was earthly in them. (Col. 3:1-4 ff.)

CHAPTER X

THE HOLY SPIRIT AS A SOURCE OF POWER

We have seen that, at one period in the history of the church, namely the Medieval, the Holy Spirit was looked upon as a power, but that the church had complete control of this power. Does it mean that, with the rediscovery of the Holy Spirit by the Reformation, this power of the Holy Spirit can work again in the extraordinary fashion that it used in past ages? There is a tendency to evade this issue because of confusion in points of view. In some there is an absolute aversion to anything of this nature in Christianity which finds expression in the well known statement of Lord Acton that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

In the Old Testament there are many instances of the power of God's Spirit, in which power was given to do many things not ordinarily possible to man.[1] In these we see that God gave them power to lead people away from destruction, to defy the powers of evil, to declare the sins of the people and to lead the people in the paths of righteousness.

The life of Jesus was a demonstration of the power of the Holy Spirit working in and through him. After his

---

[1]Judges 2:29; 14:6; Ezek. 2:2; Micah 3:8; Zech. 4:6, to list only a portion of them.

temptation, "Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee" (Lk. 4:14); he was conscious of power going forth from him in his healings (Mark 5:30); and Peter ascribes all the acts of Jesus to the work of the Holy Spirit: "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power; how he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him." (Acts 10:38)

We have already noted how this power of the Spirit was given to the apostles and those upon whom they laid their hands in the early church. It was a special power for a special period, the infancy of the church, and passed away after its use. But this special power was not the whole story of the early church. Individuals received the Holy Spirit and it was largely through efforts of such men that the church spread. They had entered into the life, death and resurrection of the Lord and had power to overcome death and the power of sin. This action is summarized and applied today very well in the words of Dillistone:

> And now that same power is at work in the Church and in the individual. In the struggle with all the powers of darkness, the victory of the Messiah is reproduced; out of weakness men are made strong, the power of the Spirit continues to operate, sin and death are overcome.[1]

Jonathan Edwards has always been associated with those who were exponents of the power demonstrations of the Spirit; yet it is of interest to note his later reflections upon such religious emotions:

---

[1]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 62.

> (1) The fact that he has these emotions does not prove that God is not working. (2) The fact of the emotions does not prove that he is moved of God. (3) Emotions are not validated of themselves.[1]

That which does validate the power of the Holy Spirit in the individual is the "edifying of the Church" and the "fruits of the Spirit."

The need of the power of the Holy Spirit in the life of the individual is well brought out by an illustration used by H. D. Gray. Two pieces of metal lie side by side. They look exactly alike. But one can lead through forest and over hill safely to home. The other one cannot do this although it looks the same. Why? One is magnetized and has within it unseen power.[2] Just so, the Christian has a power to guide and direct, to give strength and insight to his life.

The chief function of the church is to speak out the whole council of God. Jesus and the prophets spoke out against the evils of their day, and the church must do so today and all days. Dillistone puts it this way:

> Power absolutized -- that is the Anti-Christ, and against any such power, the Christian must bear witness even to the point of suffering and death, in dependence upon and in the Holy Spirit Himself.[3]

We have seen examples of this in World War II as the Confessing Church spoke out against the naked and abusive power in Germany.

We can see that through the years this power coming

---

[1]Jonathan Edwards, Religious Emotions. Class notes, "Christian Theology," Hugh Vernon White, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, 1950.

[2]Gray, op. cit., p. 62.

[3]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 64.

from the Holy Spirit has been the source of courage and strength to the church. To borrow a phrase, it is "The Hero in the Soul."

By far the greatest question we have to face today is the use of the power of the Spirit in all sorts of attractive and lucrative enterprises. It is well pointed out that the apostles and the early church did not conduct so-called "healing meetings"; they did not exhort and call for people to come forward for physical healing.[1] The power of the Spirit cannot be identified with every emotional frenzy; we today need to test the spirits. We must remember that the Holy Spirit is holy and will be identified by holiness; and its power will be that of goodness, truth, reverence and love. Our own spirit can become like the Holy Spirit with the resultant power if we will test ourselves by the same ideals and then live by them.

---

[1]Hoven, op. cit., p. 87.

CHAPTER XI

A SOURCE OF GUIDANCE THROUGH THE WORD

We have seen that the greatest contribution made by the reformers to the work of the Holy Spirit was in the realm of the Word or Revelation. Walter M. Horton sums this up well when he says:

> God cannot contradict himself, they said, since it is one and the same God who reveals himself (1) in all nature, as our Creator, (2) in history, and above all in Christ, as our Redeemer and Saviour and (3) in our hearts, as our secret Counsellor and Comforter, it follows that the internal revelation of God in our hearts must be in harmony with the external revelation of God in nature and history.[1]

He goes on to show that this was the reason the extremist and radical sects were rejected by Protestants, and then says:

> The function of the Spirit was not to take the place of "Scripture and right reason," but to give an "inward witness" to their truth and to interpret the meaning of this abiding truth freshly, in the light of changing events.[2]

The charge that Protestantism has, by its attitude toward the "inner witness", fostered and perpetuated a sort of anarchy which is termed "private interpretation," is to some extent historically true, that is, where the right application of principles has not been carried out. The Spirit is given to each Christian and no teacher has a right to

---

[1]Walter M. Horton, Our Christian Faith (Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1945), p. 43.

[2]Ibid., p. 44.

impose his judgments on others, for Paul says, "Let every one be fully convinced in his own mind." (Rom. 14:5) E. F. Scott says it well:

> But while each individual Christian must think for himself, under the guidance of the Spirit, the facts are the same for all, and it is these, not opinions about them, which constitute the revelation.[1]

The imposing of opinions has had a wide and varied history in Protestantism, and the facts have often been lost under a voicing of opinions. The important consideration is to determine the facts and then to gain their meaning. But it is not our purpose to go into the long history of criticism.

Our particular concern is the guidance of the Word. It is the word of the Spirit, "because no prophecy ever came by the impulse of man, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God" (II Pet. 1:21); and "in many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he had spoken to us by a Son" (Heb. 1:1-2). This is what was believed and declared by the early church.

Paul further strengthened this thought of guidance by the Spirit when he wrote:

> For what person knows a man's thoughts except the spirit of the man which is in him? So also no one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God. Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God, that we might understand the gifts bestowed on us by God . . . . The spiritual man judges all things, but is himself judged by no one. For who has known the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ. (I Cor. 2:11-12, 15-16)

---

[1]Scott, The Purpose of the Gospels, op. cit., p. 41.

This is difficult for the world to comprehend, a world that looks for objective truth and holds that this is the only kind of truth -- an objective, impersonal truth that can be proved. Paul declares that our faith is in an objective, personal truth. It is God himself who tells you that the gospel Word, which comes from the outside, is his word. He testifies to the truth of the gospel through the Holy Spirit. The gospel comes to us as truth, the truth of a person. D. M. Baillie gives a good description of how this gospel comes to us as truth:

> And how does that story authenticate itself to us, so that we become sure it is the truth? Not by mere historical argument (of "flesh and blood"), but by the work of the Holy Spirit in our hearts through the witness of the Apostles and of the whole "catholic and apostolic Church." When the story is told us, as worked out in the Church, and with the testimony of the Church, the Holy Spirit applies it to our hearts, it opens our eyes, and we know it is true.[1]

It is the gospel that first brings life into the hearer and to this Paul lays his paternal relationship to the Corinthian Church. (I Cor. 4:15) From that day unto this the gospel as preached has been the author of life as well as its guide. Since it is certainly the human voice that proclaims this gospel, how can it possibly be the word of God? Karl Barth says a good word for us here:

> The Spirit is the great, the only possibility, in virtue of which men can so speak of Christ that their language becomes testimony, therefore that the revelation of God in Christ becomes actual anew by their

---

[1]Baillie, op. cit., p. 52.

> speaking . . . . The Holy Spirit is the empowering to speak of Christ. He is the equipment of the prophet and the apostle, He is the call to the Church to serve the Word.[1]

As one speaks the gospel story or as he reads that story, there is a voice not human that testifies to it and one is made conscious of its truth.

From what has been said two facts are evident as to the gospel. First, the preaching of the word of God needs the work of the Holy Spirit; and in order to preach it with power, the reception of the Holy Spirit is also needed. Second, the hearing of the word of God is also needed in order to bring into flower the fruit of the Holy Spirit.[2] It is only because of the work of the Holy Spirit that we can accept the gospel as the word of God, "which is the power of God unto salvation."

It is often said that all of this happened so long ago and the world has made such vast progress that the church with its old time message, its "old time religion," has fallen far behind and is out of date. E. F. Scott shows that the church advances with the world's progress although the beliefs may differ from the fathers; but he hastens to say:

> This does not mean, however, that the work done by Christ in an age long past has now spent its force, and something else is needed for this later age. The work has an eternal value, and history has only brought us an ever fuller comprehension of what Christ achieved for us. "The Spirit will receive the things that are mine and show them unto you" (John 16:14); that is, the

---

[1]Karl Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), pp. 520-21.

[2]Cunliffe-Jones, op. cit., p. 68. Cf. Acts 4:31; 6:2-4; 13:1-5; Eph. 1:13-14; Phil. 1:14; I Thess. 2:13.

> future will illuminate what Christ himself did for men while he was still with them. He appeared in history in order to disclose to us the essential meaning of all history.[1]

Scott sees a progressive guidance of the Holy Spirit based upon the eternal truths that Jesus lived in history. This Word that he revealed is always vital and applicable to our day or any day. Opinions may and do differ, but the central truth is always the same. "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever." (Heb. 13:8) He is the "fundamental common character," the "objective personal truth," of which the Spirit continuously gives witness through the spoken and written Word.

---

[1]Scott, The Purpose of the Gospels, op. cit., p. 159.

CHAPTER XII

THE HOLY SPIRIT AS A SOURCE OF UNITY AND ORDER

We have already indicated that one of our major issues for today is that of unity of the Body of Christ, and that the work of the Holy Spirit has a very direct connection, in fact a solution, to the problem of unity if we have the grace to use what has been given. There is a possible inference in this statement which needs clarification. God's Spirit does not work only in the church, the Body of Christ. He has revealed himself in other places outside of Christ, but it is the same God revealed that was revealed by Christ.[1] God could not be God without a deep and sincere concern for all his creation. He has revealed himself in the fullest degree in Jesus Christ, and we thus feel that our primary concern should be the unity of the Body of Christ. That this was the mind of Christ is indicated in his prayer:

> I do not pray for these only, but also for those who are to believe in me through their word, that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. (John 17:20-21)

There can be no doubt that the church and the world have a very close relationship and that the work of the Holy Spirit has a direct bearing upon this since it is the witness

---

[1]Gustaf Aulén, The Faith of the Christian Church (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948), p. 253.

of the Word that Jesus views as the agency of bringing accord. Jesus was here expressing what he knew to be the will of God, and the work of the Holy Spirit is the perpetuation of that expression in the world. The temptations of Jesus show the fine line of difference between God and evil, that of knowing and doing the will of God. Certainly unity is in the will of God and thus must be a first consideration in the church.

Disorder has been a chief problem of our world since the various races have had words which express the idea of order. In India it was rita; in China it was tao; in Iran it was asha; in Egypt it was ma'at; in Greece it was dike; and in Rome it was fas. Thus the best minds of ancient times could think of community as only possible on the principle of order which they saw as the basic plan of the universe.[1] This is the world that we live in and it is the will of God that it shall be one. A sort of prayer is voiced by Dillistone as he says:

> The two horns of individualsim and collectivism constitute a tragic dilemma within modern social life. The tension between those who desire to plan and those who desire to remain free is acute. Cannot the Church so regain its harmony and order through the renewed guidance of the Spirit that it may bring light to the world's darkness and lead men into "the tranquillity which springs from Order" which is the way of peace.[2]

If we can offer a fervent amen to this, then the injunction should be the proverb quoted by Jesus, "Physician, heal thyself."

We have been noting these two horns of individualism

---

[1]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 71.

[2]Ibid., p. 81.

and collectivism (using other terms, but still denoting the same general idea) through the history of the church in relation to the Holy Spirit. The conflict between individualism and collectivism alternated back and forth from one to the other. In either case the real work of the church has been hampered or curtailed. One of our difficulties has been that Jesus set up no system of doctrine with a list of answers for every problem. Other religionists have noted this and made their comparisons to the work of the Koran or Hadith. J. W. Bowman, in noting this, has suggested that the church's answer to this seeming lack of authority is the witness of the divine revelation, which the Spirit of Christ is, as being in her midst. The faith that saw Jesus as the revelation of God also knew that he lives and guides the church by his Spirit.[1] It is well to consider the conception of the early church in this:

> So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow-citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple of the Lord; in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit. (Eph. 2:19-22)

The experience of the early church was that of being a part of God's community, or household, which it is his will to build up and make into a unified whole. Having the Spirit was that mark which joined the individual to the whole.

Upon this point Dillistone says:

---

[1]J. W. Bowman, The Religion of Maturity (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948), p. 283.

> All members of the Christian Church were through baptism initiated into a single Body, which is the Body of the Messiah; and being thus initiated they became partakers of the one Spirit by which the Body is held together and unified.[1]

Dillistone goes on to show that the fruits of the Spirit in their lives were not just native powers and capacities, although each had his particular endowment, but that they were heightened in the Christian fellowship as used for the common good, gaining their value from love. Thus, rightly received, the promotion of individualism should not be the result, nor on the other hand should the fellowship feel the need to control the workings of the Holy Spirit. We must always remember that "Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her" (Eph. 5:25), and what we are, we are by the grace of God. Nels Ferré makes a point as to the reception of the Spirit that is pertinent here:

> "Christ in you" is "the hope of glory," but the Christ who is seeable and receivable only through the Holy Spirit. Only in the Spirit and according to the law of the Spirit, which is "joy and peace," are we sons and "joint heirs with Christ." Only in the Spirit can we walk "even as he walked." Only in the Spirit can we say, "Abba, Father."[2]

As Christians, it would seem from this that we should have a sense of humble service in using all that we have received to the glory and honor of him who has so generously given to us.

We have already noted that Paul urged the disciples to strive for the "more excellent way" of love. We must not

---

[1]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 76.

[2]Ferré, op. cit., p. 101 f.

forget what Jesus said about it:

> A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another; even as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another. (John 13:34-35)

This central message of Jesus was well established in the early church, being repeated over and over again and in nearly all the epistles.[1] Our conviction is that there is a connection between the prayer which Jesus made for the unity of all who believe on him so that the world might believe, and this other thought that through love the world would know that we were his disciples. Let us keep in mind that it is the word agape that is used, an ideal of love that did not enter the world until Christ came. That which gave the pull of purpose and was redemptive was this love which in a real way was the realm of the Holy Spirit.[2]

That the fruitage of love as given by Paul (I Cor. 13) and the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22-23) are almost a direct parallel, as we have shown, is tremendously significant. It is here that the whole of the Christian life has power and significance; it is here that the entire Christian Church is in reality bound together. This is the thought of Nels Ferré:

> The truth of Christianity is centrally Christ as the Agape of God revealed and made effective for an ignorant, needy and sinful world. The living truth of a personal event is the rock of revelation. That,

---

[1] I John 3:23; I Thes. 4:9; I Peter 1:22; Heb. 13:1; Eph. 5:2.

[2] Ferré, op. cit., p. 89.

> and only that, is the criterion of Christianity. This criterion must be applied to all the facts, giving them their meaning and context.[1]

As it was in the days of Paul, so it is today. All our teaching, all our prophesying, all our building, all our systems, all our doctrines, if they have not love, are nothing, NOTHING.

When we have really within the body of Christ applied these criteria, the world will listen to us because we will be that for which we were called forth in Jesus Christ, a unified body in which dwells the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 92 f.

CHAPTER XIII

A BOND OF FELLOWSHIP IN WORSHIP

The matter of Christian fellowship and worship is in reality a part of the unity of the church; but we have seen fit to place our remarks on the work of the Holy Spirit in these areas apart from the other because in a singular way the unity of the church is expressed in fellowship and in worship. We recognize that a separation into different categories is unnatural and artificial, and only justify this seeming separation on the grounds of emphasis.

Our concern today is in the area of the making of new fellowships, or setting up tests of fellowship other than those given by our Lord; for in these actions of men the work of the Holy Spirit is hindered. It is in the area of worship, its forms and creeds and color lines, as well as doctrines, that the bond of peace is broken. In these two relationships the life of the church is more truly expressed and the lives of Christians more genuinely affected.

Jesus touched on the fundamental problem when he said that our love for the brethren would show to all that we are his disciples. The love of the brethren is difficult and because this has been true in history, the limitation of those we should call brethren has been made a device. Possibly the greatest barrier to our coming into a larger fellowship with

the brethren is something innate within each individual. It is the real point of tension. Deep down in every child there is the desire to put self first. This self-centeredness or selfishness, if not what is termed "original sin," is certainly the tap root of what is meant by that term. On the other hand, the Father insists on the family as being first. "No person, however, by himself, can ever genuinely, wholeheartedly and continually put the family first." Our real need is of an outside force to guide us and this force can be supplied by God.[1] It was this need in all that was supplied by God in Christ. We must be born into God's family, the Christian fellowship. If it could be done otherwise by our own efforts, then we would be self-sufficient and have no need for the larger relationship. Only as we fall in love with the Lord and out of love with self are we capable by the Holy Spirit of saying, "Abba, Father." As sons, then, we have partaken of the family Spirit and are able to love in God's family way. It was this expression of fellowship that caused the non-Christians to say of the early church, "Behold, how they love one another."

Koinonia is the Greek word used for this term of fellowship, which in its root meaning denotes participation in, or sharing. Dillistone remarks on this that "it is to participate in the Spirit, the Spirit which flowed into the fellowship from Him who was its head, even Christ."[2] If we consider

---

[1]Nels F. S. Ferré, Pillars of Faith (New York: Harper & Bros., 1948), p. 40.

[2]Dillistone, op. cit., p. 75.

that this entails a twofold aspect, we shall gain a better insight into the New Testament idea of fellowship. The Christian came into union with Christ, was "in Christ" and participated in his life through receiving the gift of the Spirit; and on the other hand, the Christian entered into the Body of Christ and participated in the fellowship of the brethren in their mutual sharing of this gift of the Spirit. Thus the "new birth" is the beginning of a new kind of life; we are born into a genuine community with a belongingness to all. Nels Ferré makes much of the fact that we are related to the whole fellowship, not just to one; and that the Holy Spirit never saves anyone as an individual because he saves us only as we are willing to become members of the fellowship.[1] The prodigal son's selfishness was only overcome and cured as he came back into the family fellowship. And his desire was, we note, to be a servant.

This point of tension that we have noted in the history of the work of the Holy Spirit, the tendency to break out into individualism, is something that must be brought into the control of the Spirit that dwells in the church. But this is not the church as an institution but as a family, as a fellowship of equals.

Just so the family spirit is best fostered and perpetuated not by isolation but by togetherness. Worship is the act that serves this need. It is the worship of the Father from whom the family gains its name and Spirit, from whom

---

[1]Ferré, Pillars of Faith, op. cit., p. 41.

they learn and by whose will they are guided. The spiritual aspirations of man are only realized in communion with the Father, within the relationship of his spirit speaking with the Divine Spirit. "It is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God." (Rom. 8:16) Thus can man seek to grasp the divine plan and purpose.[1] Our Scriptures contain the word of the Spirit, and these speak to us of God's will and desires. It is true that one may read these Scriptures alone and receive inspiration, for in truth that is an everyday happening; but even this is in relation to the fellowship, for the building up of the Body of Christ.

Prayer is a real part of worship, and much could be said concerning its form and subject matter. We want to note only the leading of the Holy Spirit in prayer. One grows in prayer, and this growth is a definite part of the work of the Holy Spirit. "Likewise the Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words." (Rom. 8:26) This aid is always beyond our present insight and spiritual growth, and it is by his intercession that we find ourselves in harmony with the will of God. As through prayer we adore, praise, thank, and petition God, there is that common voice of the Spirit interceding for and binding together those who have a part in the "Amen." This guidance of the Spirit in prayer is needed. For often we pray for that which we do not need. We need to worship not so much to get

---

[1]Brightman, op. cit., p. 126.

what we feel that we need, but in order to want better things. This grace is supplied through the work of the Holy Spirit.

Preaching is a part of worship, sometimes over estimated and at other times overlooked. The prophet has been God's messenger who has spoken his word for ages past. It is not the messenger that is deified although this seems to take place at times as a perversion; but it is God who is speaking and making known his will.[1] So in preaching, as the fellowship comes together, the message of God comes to them. But only as the messenger is moved by the Spirit does it become other than his own voice. We especially like the way H. V. White has worded this idea:

> But this is not a human voice; indeed, it usually contradicts and transcends all the human voices the prophet has heard. It is a voice speaking directly within and to the prophet's soul, and with such an overwhelming accent of authority that the prophet must speak to his fellows whatever the cost.[2]

These words are generally directed toward the prophets of the Old Testament period, but in truth they apply to the prophet of all ages. According to many peoples' experience, one could almost say that in the sense in which this is given, we have no prophets today, or at least very few. There is a need for real prophets.

If one realizes that in Jesus God gave full expression of his will, "He hath spoken in His Son," when the Christian community comes together to worship, it should not be a drab

---

[1]Hugh V. White, "Religious Experience and the Knowledge of God," Hibbert Journal, Vol. 37 (London: Geo. Allen & Unwin Ltd.), 1938-39, p. 611 f.

[2]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 611.

and uninspiring experience. The communion of the Spirit, his message of divine direction, should give to her the leading and power that she has need of to meet all the challenges of the day. There must be more of the preaching of Christ, for it is here that the Holy Spirit has the greatest opportunity to affect life.[1] It is only as the church takes from Christ and gives to the world that it has the promise of the direction of the Holy Spirit. (John 16:14)

We should like to close with a quotation from Dillistone that seems very comprehensive on the work of the Holy Spirit:

> Convictor and Comforter, Destroyer and Upbuilder, Purifier and Sanctifier, Ruler and Lover -- such is the Holy Spirit. Yet, in the last resort, His aim is ever to glorify Christ in us, and to lift us into the full enjoyment of our fellowship in the love of God.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 616.

[2] Dillistone, op. cit., p. 122.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aulén, Gustaf. The Faith of the Christian Church. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948.

Baillie, D. M. God Was in Christ. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.

Bainton, Roland. Here I Stand. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.

Barth, Karl. The Doctrine of the Word of God. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.

Bethune-Baker, J. F. An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine. 7th ed. London: Thethuen Co., 1942.

Bettenson, Henry. Editor. Documents of the Christian Church. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Bowman, J. W. The Religion of Maturity. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948.

Calvin, John. The Institutes of the Christian Religion. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936.

Cunliffe-Jones, H. The Holy Spirit. London: Independent Press Ltd., 1943.

Dillistone, F. W. The Holy Spirit in the Life of Today. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1947.

Enslin, M. S. Christian Beginnings. New York: Harper & Bros., 1938.

Ferré, Nels F. S. Christianity and Society. New York: Harper & Bros., 1950.

_____. Pillars of Faith. New York: Harper & Bros., 1948.

Forget, J. "Holy Ghost," The Catholic Encyclopedia. New York:

Goldstein, Morris. Jesus in the Jewish Tradition. New York: Macmillan Co., 1950.

Goodspeed, E. J. A Life of Jesus. New York: Harper & Bros., 1950.

Gray, Henry D. A Theology for Christian Youth. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1941.

Harnack, Adolf. Outline of the History of Dogma. Trans. E. K. Mitchell. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1893.

Horton, Walter M. Our Christian Faith. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1945.

Hoven, Victor E. Outlines of Biblical Doctrine. Eugene: The Northwest Christian College Press, 1948.

Hoyle, R. Birch. "The Holy Spirit," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928. Vol. XI.

_____. The Holy Spirit and St. Paul. London: Hodder & Co., 1927.

Johnson, A. S. The Holy Spirit and the Human Mind. Knoxville: Gaut-Ogden Co. Press, 1903.

Knox, John. Chapters in the Life of Paul. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.

Krauss, S. Jesus of Nazareth. The Jewish Encyclopedia. Vol. VII. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1906.

Latourette, K. S. A History of the Expansion of Christianity. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Bros., 1937.

Mackintosh, H. R. Types of Modern Theology. London: Nisbet Co., 1947.

McGarvey, J. W. The Fourfold Gospel. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Co., 1902.

Moffatt, James. The Theology of the Gospels. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Nuttall, G. F. The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

Parsons, E. L. Resources in a Genuinely Christian Church. The Interseminary Series. Vol. I, Book 2. New York: Harper & Bros., 1946.

Pauck, Wilhelm. The Heritage of the Reformation. Chicago: The Modern Franklin Co., 1950.

Robinson, H. W. "The Holy Spirit," Encyclopedia Britannica. Vol. XI. 14th edition. New York: The Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1936.

Robinson, J. Armitage. St. Irenaeus, The Apostolic Preaching. New York: Macmillan Co., 1920.

Scott, E. F. Man and Society in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946.

Scott, E. F. The Purpose of the Gospels. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.

Slattery, Charles L. The Light Within. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1915.

Smart, James D. What a Man Can Believe. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943.

Swete, H. B. "The Holy Spirit," Hastings Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. II. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

_____. The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church. New York: Macmillan Co., 1909.

The Anti-Nicene Fathers. Contra Celsus, Vol. IV. Acts of Pilate, Vol. VII. First Apology, Vol. I. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1886.

The Holy Scriptures. A New Translation. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1948.

The New Testament. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Co., 1946.

The New Testament. An American Translation by Edgar J. Goodspeed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1923.

The New Testament in Modern Speech. Trans. Richard F. Weymouth. 3rd ed., Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1909.

Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1949.

Articles

White, Hugh V. "Religious Experience and the Knowledge of God," Hibbard Journal, Vol. 37, 1938-39. London: Geo. Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Date Due

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

GTU Library
3 2400 00629 5897

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall